

AM. 1930 woo  
J. R. Woods  
c. 1



Boston University  
College of Liberal Arts  
Library

THE GIFT OF The Author

June 1930

A.M. 1930

wood  
51

p6550



BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

THESIS

FOREIGN AFFAIRS IN GRANT'S ADMINISTRATION

SUBMITTED BY

JANE R. WOODS

(A.B. BOSTON UNIVERSITY, 1907)

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

1930

BOSTON UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS  
LIBRARY

p6550



378.744

BO

A.M. 1930

CONTENTS.

woo

PAGES.

I. Introduction	I-5
II. The Alabama Claims	6
A. Rejection by the Senate	6
I. Sumner's Speech	6
2. Senate Action	6-7
B. Effects of the Speech	7
C. Reopening of Negotiations	7
I. Appointment of Motley	7-8
2. Motley's Instructions	8
3. Motley's Interview with Lord Clarendon	8
4. Withdrawal of Negotiations to Washington	9
5. Fish-Rose Negotiations	9-10
6. Fish-Thornton Negotiations	11
7. Grant's Message, Dec. 5, 1870	12
8. Rose's Second Visit, Jan. 9, 1871	12-13
9. Sumner's Memorandum, Jan. 17, 1871	14-15
10. The Appointment of the Joint High Commission	15
11. The Treaty of Washington, May 8, 1871	16-17
12. Ratification By The Senate	17
D. Geneva Arbitration	17-19
III. Cuban Intervention	17
A. The Cuban Rebellion	20-21
B. Attitude Of Administration	21-22
C. Mediation	22-23
D. Intervention	23-25



1-5	1. Introduction
6	2. The American Objectives
7	3. Rejection by the Senate
8	4. Summary of the Speech
9	5. Summary of the Speech
10	6. Rejection of the Speech
11	7. Rejection of the Speech
12	8. Rejection of the Speech
13	9. Rejection of the Speech
14	10. Rejection of the Speech
15	11. Rejection of the Speech
16	12. Rejection of the Speech
17	13. Rejection of the Speech
18	14. Rejection of the Speech
19	15. Rejection of the Speech
20	16. Rejection of the Speech
21	17. Rejection of the Speech
22	18. Rejection of the Speech
23	19. Rejection of the Speech
24	20. Rejection of the Speech
25	21. Rejection of the Speech
26	22. Rejection of the Speech
27	23. Rejection of the Speech
28	24. Rejection of the Speech
29	25. Rejection of the Speech
30	26. Rejection of the Speech
31	27. Rejection of the Speech
32	28. Rejection of the Speech
33	29. Rejection of the Speech
34	30. Rejection of the Speech
35	31. Rejection of the Speech
36	32. Rejection of the Speech
37	33. Rejection of the Speech
38	34. Rejection of the Speech
39	35. Rejection of the Speech
40	36. Rejection of the Speech
41	37. Rejection of the Speech
42	38. Rejection of the Speech
43	39. Rejection of the Speech
44	40. Rejection of the Speech
45	41. Rejection of the Speech
46	42. Rejection of the Speech
47	43. Rejection of the Speech
48	44. Rejection of the Speech
49	45. Rejection of the Speech
50	46. Rejection of the Speech
51	47. Rejection of the Speech
52	48. Rejection of the Speech
53	49. Rejection of the Speech
54	50. Rejection of the Speech
55	51. Rejection of the Speech
56	52. Rejection of the Speech
57	53. Rejection of the Speech
58	54. Rejection of the Speech
59	55. Rejection of the Speech
60	56. Rejection of the Speech
61	57. Rejection of the Speech
62	58. Rejection of the Speech
63	59. Rejection of the Speech
64	60. Rejection of the Speech
65	61. Rejection of the Speech
66	62. Rejection of the Speech
67	63. Rejection of the Speech
68	64. Rejection of the Speech
69	65. Rejection of the Speech
70	66. Rejection of the Speech
71	67. Rejection of the Speech
72	68. Rejection of the Speech
73	69. Rejection of the Speech
74	70. Rejection of the Speech
75	71. Rejection of the Speech
76	72. Rejection of the Speech
77	73. Rejection of the Speech
78	74. Rejection of the Speech
79	75. Rejection of the Speech
80	76. Rejection of the Speech
81	77. Rejection of the Speech
82	78. Rejection of the Speech
83	79. Rejection of the Speech
84	80. Rejection of the Speech
85	81. Rejection of the Speech
86	82. Rejection of the Speech
87	83. Rejection of the Speech
88	84. Rejection of the Speech
89	85. Rejection of the Speech
90	86. Rejection of the Speech
91	87. Rejection of the Speech
92	88. Rejection of the Speech
93	89. Rejection of the Speech
94	90. Rejection of the Speech
95	91. Rejection of the Speech
96	92. Rejection of the Speech
97	93. Rejection of the Speech
98	94. Rejection of the Speech
99	95. Rejection of the Speech
100	96. Rejection of the Speech



## CONTENTS. (CONT.)

	PAGES.
E. Congressional Action	25-26
F. Events And Diplomatic Negotiations 1872-73	26
1. Fish's Protests	26-27
2. Seizure of Virginius	27-28
3. Reaction In Spain And In The United States	28-29
4. Fish-Polo Negotiations	29-31
G. Appointment of Caleb Cushing	31-32
H. Fish's New Policy	32-34
I. Breakdown of Fish's Policy	34-35
IV. Project for San Domingo Annexation	36
A. Grant's Expansion Program	36
1. Situation in San Domingo	36
B. Grant's Attitude	36-37
C. Attitude of the Cabinet	37-38
D. Babcock's Activities	38-39
E. An Awkward Cabinet Meeting	39-40
F. Fish Offers His Resignation	40
G. Babcock's Return to San Domingo	40-41
H. Grant Visits Sumner	41-42
I. Treaty Before The Senate	42-43
J. The Removal of Motley	43
K. Presidential Message, Dec. 5, 1870	43-44
L. Removal of Sumner	44-45
M. The Project Dropped	45-46



147-15  
148-16  
149-17  
150-18  
151-19  
152-20  
153-21  
154-22  
155-23  
156-24  
157-25  
158-26  
159-27  
160-28  
161-29  
162-30  
163-31  
164-32  
165-33  
166-34  
167-35  
168-36  
169-37  
170-38  
171-39  
172-40  
173-41  
174-42  
175-43  
176-44  
177-45  
178-46  
179-47  
180-48  
181-49  
182-50  
183-51  
184-52  
185-53  
186-54  
187-55  
188-56  
189-57  
190-58  
191-59  
192-60  
193-61  
194-62  
195-63  
196-64  
197-65  
198-66  
199-67  
200-68  
201-69  
202-70  
203-71  
204-72  
205-73  
206-74  
207-75  
208-76  
209-77  
210-78  
211-79  
212-80  
213-81  
214-82  
215-83  
216-84  
217-85  
218-86  
219-87  
220-88  
221-89  
222-90  
223-91  
224-92  
225-93  
226-94  
227-95  
228-96  
229-97  
230-98  
231-99  
232-100  
233-101  
234-102  
235-103  
236-104  
237-105  
238-106  
239-107  
240-108  
241-109  
242-110  
243-111  
244-112  
245-113  
246-114  
247-115  
248-116  
249-117  
250-118  
251-119  
252-120  
253-121  
254-122  
255-123  
256-124  
257-125  
258-126  
259-127  
260-128  
261-129  
262-130  
263-131  
264-132  
265-133  
266-134  
267-135  
268-136  
269-137  
270-138  
271-139  
272-140  
273-141  
274-142  
275-143  
276-144  
277-145  
278-146  
279-147  
280-148  
281-149  
282-150  
283-151  
284-152  
285-153  
286-154  
287-155  
288-156  
289-157  
290-158  
291-159  
292-160  
293-161  
294-162  
295-163  
296-164  
297-165  
298-166  
299-167  
300-168  
301-169  
302-170  
303-171  
304-172  
305-173  
306-174  
307-175  
308-176  
309-177  
310-178  
311-179  
312-180  
313-181  
314-182  
315-183  
316-184  
317-185  
318-186  
319-187  
320-188  
321-189  
322-190  
323-191  
324-192  
325-193  
326-194  
327-195  
328-196  
329-197  
330-198  
331-199  
332-200  
333-201  
334-202  
335-203  
336-204  
337-205  
338-206  
339-207  
340-208  
341-209  
342-210  
343-211  
344-212  
345-213  
346-214  
347-215  
348-216  
349-217  
350-218  
351-219  
352-220  
353-221  
354-222  
355-223  
356-224  
357-225  
358-226  
359-227  
360-228  
361-229  
362-230  
363-231  
364-232  
365-233  
366-234  
367-235  
368-236  
369-237  
370-238  
371-239  
372-240  
373-241  
374-242  
375-243  
376-244  
377-245  
378-246  
379-247  
380-248  
381-249  
382-250  
383-251  
384-252  
385-253  
386-254  
387-255  
388-256  
389-257  
390-258  
391-259  
392-260  
393-261  
394-262  
395-263  
396-264  
397-265  
398-266  
399-267  
400-268  
401-269  
402-270  
403-271  
404-272  
405-273  
406-274  
407-275  
408-276  
409-277  
410-278  
411-279  
412-280  
413-281  
414-282  
415-283  
416-284  
417-285  
418-286  
419-287  
420-288  
421-289  
422-290  
423-291  
424-292  
425-293  
426-294  
427-295  
428-296  
429-297  
430-298  
431-299  
432-300  
433-301  
434-302  
435-303  
436-304  
437-305  
438-306  
439-307  
440-308  
441-309  
442-310  
443-311  
444-312  
445-313  
446-314  
447-315  
448-316  
449-317  
450-318  
451-319  
452-320  
453-321  
454-322  
455-323  
456-324  
457-325  
458-326  
459-327  
460-328  
461-329  
462-330  
463-331  
464-332  
465-333  
466-334  
467-335  
468-336  
469-337  
470-338  
471-339  
472-340  
473-341  
474-342  
475-343  
476-344  
477-345  
478-346  
479-347  
480-348  
481-349  
482-350  
483-351  
484-352  
485-353  
486-354  
487-355  
488-356  
489-357  
490-358  
491-359  
492-360  
493-361  
494-362  
495-363  
496-364  
497-365  
498-366  
499-367  
500-368  
501-369  
502-370  
503-371  
504-372  
505-373  
506-374  
507-375  
508-376  
509-377  
510-378  
511-379  
512-380  
513-381  
514-382  
515-383  
516-384  
517-385  
518-386  
519-387  
520-388  
521-389  
522-390  
523-391  
524-392  
525-393  
526-394  
527-395  
528-396  
529-397  
530-398  
531-399  
532-400  
533-401  
534-402  
535-403  
536-404  
537-405  
538-406  
539-407  
540-408  
541-409  
542-410  
543-411  
544-412  
545-413  
546-414  
547-415  
548-416  
549-417  
550-418  
551-419  
552-420  
553-421  
554-422  
555-423  
556-424  
557-425  
558-426  
559-427  
560-428  
561-429  
562-430  
563-431  
564-432  
565-433  
566-434  
567-435  
568-436  
569-437  
570-438  
571-439  
572-440  
573-441  
574-442  
575-443  
576-444  
577-445  
578-446  
579-447  
580-448  
581-449  
582-450  
583-451  
584-452  
585-453  
586-454  
587-455  
588-456  
589-457  
590-458  
591-459  
592-460  
593-461  
594-462  
595-463  
596-464  
597-465  
598-466  
599-467  
600-468  
601-469  
602-470  
603-471  
604-472  
605-473  
606-474  
607-475  
608-476  
609-477  
610-478  
611-479  
612-480  
613-481  
614-482  
615-483  
616-484  
617-485  
618-486  
619-487  
620-488  
621-489  
622-490  
623-491  
624-492  
625-493  
626-494  
627-495  
628-496  
629-497  
630-498  
631-499  
632-500  
633-501  
634-502  
635-503  
636-504  
637-505  
638-506  
639-507  
640-508  
641-509  
642-510  
643-511  
644-512  
645-513  
646-514  
647-515  
648-516  
649-517  
650-518  
651-519  
652-520  
653-521  
654-522  
655-523  
656-524  
657-525  
658-526  
659-527  
660-528  
661-529  
662-530  
663-531  
664-532  
665-533  
666-534  
667-535  
668-536  
669-537  
670-538  
671-539  
672-540  
673-541  
674-542  
675-543  
676-544  
677-545  
678-546  
679-547  
680-548  
681-549  
682-550  
683-551  
684-552  
685-553  
686-554  
687-555  
688-556  
689-557  
690-558  
691-559  
692-560  
693-561  
694-562  
695-563  
696-564  
697-565  
698-566  
699-567  
700-568  
701-569  
702-570  
703-571  
704-572  
705-573  
706-574  
707-575  
708-576  
709-577  
710-578  
711-579  
712-580  
713-581  
714-582  
715-583  
716-584  
717-585  
718-586  
719-587  
720-588  
721-589  
722-590  
723-591  
724-592  
725-593  
726-594  
727-595  
728-596  
729-597  
730-598  
731-599  
732-600  
733-601  
734-602  
735-603  
736-604  
737-605  
738-606  
739-607  
740-608  
741-609  
742-610  
743-611  
744-612  
745-613  
746-614  
747-615  
748-616  
749-617  
750-618  
751-619  
752-620  
753-621  
754-622  
755-623  
756-624  
757-625  
758-626  
759-627  
760-628  
761-629  
762-630  
763-631  
764-632  
765-633  
766-634  
767-635  
768-636  
769-637  
770-638  
771-639  
772-640  
773-641  
774-642  
775-643  
776-644  
777-645  
778-646  
779-647  
780-648  
781-649  
782-650  
783-651  
784-652  
785-653  
786-654  
787-655  
788-656  
789-657  
790-658  
791-659  
792-660  
793-661  
794-662  
795-663  
796-664  
797-665  
798-666  
799-667  
800-668  
801-669  
802-670  
803-671  
804-672  
805-673  
806-674  
807-675  
808-676  
809-677  
810-678  
811-679  
812-680  
813-681  
814-682  
815-683  
816-684  
817-685  
818-686  
819-687  
820-688  
821-689  
822-690  
823-691  
824-692  
825-693  
826-694  
827-695  
828-696  
829-697  
830-698  
831-699  
832-700  
833-701  
834-702  
835-703  
836-704  
837-705  
838-706  
839-707  
840-708  
841-709  
842-710  
843-711  
844-712  
845-713  
846-714  
847-715  
848-716  
849-717  
850-718  
851-719  
852-720  
853-721  
854-722  
855-723  
856-724  
857-725  
858-726  
859-727  
860-728  
861-729  
862-730  
863-731  
864-732  
865-733  
866-734  
867-735  
868-736  
869-737  
870-738  
871-739  
872-740  
873-741  
874-742  
875-743  
876-744  
877-745  
878-746  
879-747  
880-748  
881-749  
882-750  
883-751  
884-752  
885-753  
886-754  
887-755  
888-756  
889-757  
890-758  
891-759  
892-760  
893-761  
894-762  
895-763  
896-764  
897-765  
898-766  
899-767  
900-768  
901-769  
902-770  
903-771  
904-772  
905-773  
906-774  
907-775  
908-776  
909-777  
910-778  
911-779  
912-780  
913-781  
914-782  
915-783  
916-784  
917-785  
918-786  
919-787  
920-788  
921-789  
922-790  
923-791  
924-792  
925-793  
926-794  
927-795  
928-796  
929-797  
930-798  
931-799  
932-800  
933-801  
934-802  
935-803  
936-804  
937-805  
938-806  
939-807  
940-808  
941-809  
942-810  
943-811  
944-812  
945-813  
946-814  
947-815  
948-816  
949-817  
950-818  
951-819  
952-820  
953-821  
954-822  
955-823  
956-824  
957-825  
958-826  
959-827  
960-828  
961-829  
962-830  
963-831  
964-832  
965-833  
966-834  
967-835  
968-836  
969-837  
970-838  
971-839  
972-840  
973-841  
974-842  
975-843  
976-844  
977-845  
978-846  
979-847  
980-848  
981-849  
982-850  
983-851  
984-852  
985-853  
986-854  
987-855  
988-856  
989-857  
990-858  
991-859  
992-860  
993-861  
994-862  
995-863  
996-864  
997-865  
998-866  
999-867  
1000-868

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2014



## CONTENTS. (CONT.)

	PAGES.
V. Conclusion	
Estimate of Grant, Fish and Sumner	47-52
Bibliography	53-57



CONFIDENTIAL (CONT.)

Page 2

V. Conclusion

Analysis of the above information

Page 3

Reference



## FOREIGN AFFAIRS IN GRANT'S ADMINISTRATION.

## PART I.

## INTRODUCTION.

When Grant took office, he was confronted with two foreign problems that were pressing for a settlement. One was the Alabama controversy which arose over the legality of England's recognition of the belligerency of the Confederate States, and also over claims for damages, resulting from the depredations of the Alabama and other Confederate cruisers. These had been constructed in England under the eyes of the English officials, equipped by their connivance and welcomed in British ports, during the Civil War. In the Johnson Administration, an aroused public opinion in the United States demanded that Great Britain should make reparations for these damages, but the British Government curtly declined to arbitrate on the ground that it had been faithful in carrying out its duties as a neutral. It claimed that these cruisers had been equipped outside of British jurisdiction and that every state reserved for itself the right to be the judge of its own duty. As a result, further discussion ceased until August, 1868,



FOREIGN AFFAIRS IN GREAT BRITAIN

PART I.

INTRODUCTION.

When Grant took office, he was confronted with two foreign problems of great importance. One was the Alaskan controversy which arose over the legality of England's recognition of the sovereignty of the Confederate States, and also over claims for damages, resulting from the depredations of the Alaskan and other Confederate cruisers. These had been conducted in England under the eyes of the British officials, and by their connivance and welcomed in British courts, during the Civil War. In the Jackson Administration, an aroused public opinion in the United States demanded that Great Britain should make reparations for these damages, but the British Government was loath to accede to this demand on the ground that it had been faithful in carrying out its duties as a neutral. It claimed that these cruises had been adopted outside of British jurisdiction and that every state reserved for itself the right to be the judge of its own duty. As a result, further discussion ceased until August, 1892.

when Reverdy Johnson, the successor of Adams, who had resigned in May, arrived in London to negotiate a settlement. In the meantime, the entire atmosphere of England had undergone a change, due to the rumblings of the Franco-Prussian war. The British government, fearing that England would be drawn into the conflict and that the United States would retaliate by building Alabamas for her enemies, wished to reach an understanding, and so on January 14, 1869, Lord Clarendon, the English foreign Secretary, signed, with Johnson, a convention, providing for the submission to a mixed commission of all out-standing claims between the two countries.<sup>1</sup> This treaty was before the Senate when Grant entered the White House.

The other problem was the Cuban insurrection which seriously affected American lives and interests in the island and consequently complicated our relations with Spain. President's Grant's sympathy was with the Cubans in their attempt to overthrow Spanish rule and as his mind dwelt on territorial expansion Southward, he seriously meditated on intervention.

During Johnson's administration, Grant's attention had been directed to a project which had for its aim, the leasing of harbors in the islands of San Domingo and Saint Thomas. Rhodes says that Secretary Seward would have gladly annexed these islands but

---

1. Moore's International Arbitrations, Vol. 1.p.504



from Secretary Johnson, the success of which was not  
yet final in fact, arrived in London to negotiate a set-  
tlement. In the meantime, the United States of  
America had undergone a change, due to the influence  
of the Franco-Prussian war. The British government,  
fearing that England would be drawn into the conflict  
and that the United States would retaliate by withholding  
aid from our vessels, planned to reach an under-  
standing, and so on January 14, 1852, Lord Clarendon,  
the British foreign secretary, signed, with Johnson,  
a convention, providing for the resolution to a mixed  
commission of all outstanding claims between the two  
countries. This treaty was before the Senate when  
it entered the White House.

The other problem was the Cuban question.  
John Anthony attacked American lives and interests  
in the island and consequently complicated our rela-  
tions with Spain. President's Grant's sympathy was  
also the Cuban in their attempt to overthrow Spanish  
rule and so his mind dwelt on territorial expansion.  
Accordingly, he ardently advocated an intervention.  
Secretary Johnson's administration, Grant's atten-  
tion had been directed to a project which had for its  
aim, the landing of persons in the islands of the  
Caribbean and being Thomas. Rhodes says that Secretary  
Johnson would have gladly annexed these islands but

1  
Congress and the country frowned on the scheme. Nevertheless, when internal troubles in San Domingo broke out in 1869, Grant's persistent attempt to acquire the island led to serious complications and grave political results.

Grant entered upon his duties totally lacking in the knowledge of the science of government and the principles of international law. He was essentially a military man, and it was not surprising that, under these conditions, he made many blunders. He treated the members of Congress as if they were his subordinate officers who must fall in line with his campaign or else be disciplined. As he had no experience in dealing with politicians, he formed associations which exerted a baneful influence over his administration.

In making his cabinet appointments, without consulting the leaders of his party, he showed a lack of political judgment. Elihu Washburne of Illinois was named Secretary of State. This appointment was intended as a compliment to him, personally, and as giving him prestige for the diplomatic post to which he was afterwards assigned. A. T. Stewart, a New York merchant, and importer, was made Secretary of the Treasury; but this nomination was illegal, as there was a law which excluded business men from holding this position.

---

1. J. F. Rhodes, History of the United States, Vol. 6, p. 214.



...and the country ...  
...when ...  
...in 1862, Grant's ...  
...led to serious ...  
...

...from his ...  
...of the ...  
...of international law ...  
...and it was not ...  
...conditions, he ...  
...of Congress as it ...  
...and ...  
...as he had no ...  
...of ...  
...over his ...

In ...  
...the ...  
...political ...  
...of ...  
...as a ...  
...for the ...  
...A. L. ...  
...and ...  
...this ...  
...position.

Grant's attempt to repeal this law was defeated by Sumner. General Rawlins, his faithful adviser, was made Secretary of War. Adolph Baurie, scarcely known outside of Philadelphia, was assigned to the office of Secretary of the Navy. He resigned in favor of George Robeson, whom he recommended. John Creswell, practically unknown outside of his own state of Maryland, was made Postmaster General. Jacob Cox, an able man with a good war record, was selected as Secretary of the Interior, and E. Rockwood Hoar, a learned lawyer, and a man of high character, was chosen Attorney-General. Later, when Washburne was appointed to the diplomatic Post in France, Hamilton Fish succeeded him as Secretary of State. It was the general impression of the day that the Cabinet, with the exception of Fish, Hoar, and Cox, was respectable but weak.

To Secretary Fish, a man of education and refinement, fell the task of restraining the President and of formulating a foreign policy which would ensure success in spite of the many complications. Fish's national experience had been limited to one term each in the House and Senate, and so it was "with a heavy heart and unnumbered misgivings" that he undertook duties for which he had little taste and less aptitude.<sup>1</sup> Unaccustomed to the work, he turned for advice to Caleb Cushing, a former Attorney-General, and several times employed on confi-

---

1. E. L. Pierce, Personal Letters And Memoirs of Charles Sumner, Vol. 4, p. 379. Boston, Roberts Bros. 1893.





dential missions for the United States Government, and to Charles Sumner. The latter was a member of the Senate for seventeen years, during eight of which he was Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. He was probably the best informed of our statesmen as to foreign affairs. But while he respected their opinions, he followed his own cautious policy. Let us now turn to these complicated problems and trace the progress of the diplomatic negotiations involved to their final conclusions.



General relations for the United States Government, and  
to British America. The latter was a member of the Committee  
for seventeen years, during eight of which he was Chair-  
man of the Foreign Relations Committee. He was probably  
the best informed of our statesmen as to foreign affairs.  
but while he respected Lord's opinions, he followed his  
own cautious policy. For us was born to these conditions  
problems and crises the progress of the diplomatic negotia-  
tions involved in their final conclusions.

## PART II.

## THE ALABAMA CLAIMS.

On April 13, 1869, the Johnson-Clarendon Convention was adversely reported out of the Foreign Relations Committee to the Senate, then in executive session, by its Chairman, Charles Sumner, an idealist, who grasped the opportunity to voice his sentiments. He criticised the agreement because it failed to contain any expression of "regret" for "national injuries". These he listed as "commerce driven from the ocean" and "prolongation of the war caused by British intervention". He cited Mr. Forster to show that not a single American vessel was visible on the ocean for six weeks. He figured that this damage was one hundred and ten million dollars. Four billion dollars was expended in crushing a rebellion, which, but for the British aid, would have been suppressed in half of that time. As to "individual losses", he based his claim for damages on Cobden's<sup>1</sup> estimate of fifteen million dollars.

In the debate which followed, Senator Chandler of Michigan expressed his reaction to Sumner's speech by suggesting that England cede Canada to the United States in settlement of the claims. "I hope", he said, "such a negotiation will be open and that it will be

---

1. Charles Sumner, Works, Vol. 13, pp.53-86; Boston Advertiser, Apr. 16.

J. F. Rhodes, History of the United States, Vol. 6, pp.338-339.





a peaceful one; but if it should not be, and England insists on war, then let the war be 'short, sharp, and decisive'".<sup>1</sup> Following the discussion, a roll-call was taken which resulted in the defeat of the treaty by a vote of 54 to 1. The Senate approved of Sumner's speech and agreed to the removal of the ban of secrecy, so that the country might become acquainted with his views.

The speech met with the general approbation of the Republican Press. General Cushing wrote Sumner, "fish has stated the accordance of the Administration with you on the points of controversy with England."<sup>2</sup> But Adams, who best understood the English nation, wrote that he "doubted if England would sell Canada as the price of a release from punishment" and feared that the effect of the speech would be to end all negotiations "unless the English had lost all their spirit and character."<sup>3</sup> In a letter to Fessenden, Senator Grimes wrote, "the English people are really anticipating war with us in which they expect to be aided by France."<sup>4</sup>

Sumner expected that the President would entrust the shaping of the foreign policy to him, as both Grant and Fish had shown themselves amenable to his guidance. At his suggestion, President Grant appointed his friend

---

1. C. F. Adams, "The Treaty of Washington" in Lee at Appomattox and Other Papers, pp. 152-153.

2. E. L. Pierce, Personal Memoirs and Letters of Charles Sumner, Vol. 4, p. 389.

3. C. F. Adams, "The Treaty of Washington" in Lee At Appomattox and Other Papers, p. 103-104

4. William Salter, Life of Grimes, p. 371





John Lothrop Motley, Minister to England. The latter now prepared a memorandum which plainly showed the influence of Sumner. But Fish had no intention of surrendering his duties to Sumner, and with the Cuban situation in mind, he framed more moderate instructions. Motley was to place the cause of grievance on England's conduct "under and subject to the recognition of belligerency". Furthermore, he was to say that the government of the United States did not abandon "the hope of an early, satisfactory, and friendly settlement of the questions pending between the two governments" and that the suspension of negotiations would be regarded by Great Britain in the interest and "solely with a view to an early and friendly settlement".<sup>1</sup>

Soon after his arrival in London, Motley sought an interview with Lord Clarendon, the head of the Foreign Office. In pressing the claims, he departed from Fish's conciliatory instructions and reflected rather Sumner's bellicose views. He referred to the belligerency proclamation as the "fountain head" from which all the acts, injurious to the American people, "individually and collectively, had issued. He then went on to say that he doubted if the two nations would ever understand each other.

---

1. C. F. Adams, "The Treaty of Washington" in Lee At Appomattox and Other Papers, p. 108.



from Washington, D.C., Minister to the United States, the "afternoon" paper, a newspaper which usually shows the influence of the government, but which had no intention of supporting the policy of the government, and after the Cuban question in 1895, he raised more vigorous denunciations. However, he was to give the cause of difference on England's conduct "under and subject to the recognition of self-interest." Furthermore, he was to say that the government of the United States did not abandon "the hope of a really satisfactory, and finally satisfactory, solution of the question relating between the two governments, and that the satisfaction of the conditions was to be reached by peaceful means in the interest and "policy with a view to an early and friendly settlement."

Soon after his arrival in London, having sought an interview with the Minister, the head of the Foreign Office. In reviewing the affairs, he described the state's conciliatory intentions and reflected that the Minister's policy was, as referred to the "self-interest" proclaimed as the "London's head" from which all the acts, intentions to the American people, "individually and collectively, had issued. He then went on to say that he doubted if the two nations could ever understand each other.

---

J. C. R. Adams, "The Policy of Washington" in the "Appointments and other papers" of J. C. R.

When Grant learned of Motley's report of the interview, he was very angry, as he was contemplating a similar proclamation in the interest of the Cuban insurgents, and, going to the State Department, told Fish to dismiss him at once. Fish, although unwilling to risk a rupture with Sumner, did not wish Motley to get him into an awkward position, so he advised the President to conduct future negotiations for the settlement of the outstanding difficulties between the two nations in Washington. He cautioned delay in order to permit the passions, aroused on both sides, to subside.

The task of initiating negotiations was delicate as neither side wished to take the first step. At just this time, Caleb Cushing for the United States, and John Rose, a member of the ministry in Canada, and acting as the British Commissioner, were in Washington, negotiating in regard to the claims of the Hudson Bay and Puget Sound companies, under the terms of the treaty of 1863. Whether or not he was delegated to do so, Rose appeared eager to settle the Alabama claims and insinuated that his services would be available for the re-opening of such proceedings. Through Cushing, an interview was arranged, and Rose dined with Fish on July 9, 1869. When Rose suggested that

- 
1. Moore, International Arbitrations, Vol. 1. pp. 517-519  
 C. F. Adams, "The Treaty of Washington" in Lee at Appomattox And Other Papers, p. 116-122.





the Duke of Argyll and William Forster might come over as special envoys to negotiate a settlement, Fish advised delay "as the British were too much irritated by the rejection of the treaty, and by Sumner's speech," and Americans were too much under the influence of Sumner's policy to arrange a satisfactory settlement. "But," said he<sup>1</sup>, when the excitement subsides, if the British Government will appoint some man of high rank to offer an expression of regret, it will pave the way for a settlement."

Immediately after the interview, Rose went to England. During the Autumn, he wrote Fish that he had been sounding the Cabinet officials to ascertain their views; and that Motley's attitude appeared unfriendly. He asked if Sir Edward Thornton, the British Minister at Washington, would be acceptable for the conduct of negotiations or if he would prefer to have a new British envoy. Fish answered that Motley might have been indiscreet in some of his remarks, but he felt sure that he was desirous of bringing about harmony between the two nations. In regard to Thornton, he wrote, "In view of Sumner's position on the Foreign Relations Committee, it might be advisable to appoint another, as Thornton has angered Sumner by some of his dispatches home."<sup>2</sup>

---

1. J. C. B. Davis, Mr. Fish And The Alabama Claims, p.45-46.

2. C. F. Adams, "The Treaty of Washington" in Lee At Appomattox And Other Papers. pp.127-129



The House of Representatives and the Senate have passed a bill to amend the act of March 3, 1879, relating to the collection of duties on goods imported from the United States into the United Kingdom, and to amend the act of March 3, 1879, relating to the collection of duties on goods imported from the United Kingdom into the United States. The bill was passed by the House on March 10, 1880, and by the Senate on March 11, 1880. It will take effect on the day of its passage.

The bill is intended to amend the act of March 3, 1879, relating to the collection of duties on goods imported from the United States into the United Kingdom, and to amend the act of March 3, 1879, relating to the collection of duties on goods imported from the United Kingdom into the United States. The bill was passed by the House on March 10, 1880, and by the Senate on March 11, 1880. It will take effect on the day of its passage.

In November, 1869, four months after Rose's visit to Washington, and when he was writing Fish about Motley's attitude, the Cabinet was discussing the possibility of Great Britain's quitting Canada. Fish was urging a settlement on that basis to Thornton, the British Minister. Sir Edward Thornton stated that the Canadians complained because he had stated that Great Britain was willing to let them go whenever they wished.

In March 1870, on the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war, Fish had another conversation with Thornton. The Fenian movement was still active and Fish used this as an argument for the independence of Canada. But Thornton stated that it was impossible for Great Britain to force independence on them.

In September, 1870, Thornton again repeated this statement and concluded by saying that Canadian independence couldn't be connected with Alabama claims,"not even to the extent of providing for the reference of the question of independence to a popular vote of the people of the Dominion". "Independence", he added, "means annexation. They are one and the same thing."

In a conversation, Nov. 20, 1870, the Russian Minister suggested to Fish that the Franco-Prussian War might furnish an opportune moment to press for a settlement.

---

1. A. F. Adams, "The Treaty of Washington" in Lee At Appomattox And Other Papers. pp. 159-160.



In November, 1930, Lord Bessborough, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, and when he was visiting the Dominion of Wales, the Governor was discussing the possibility of Great Britain's defending Canada. This was during a session of the House of Commons. Lord Bessborough, the British Minister, Sir Edward Thompson stated that the Canadians considered because he had stated that Great Britain was willing to let them to know that they were.

In March 1931, on the outbreak of the Franco-British war, Lord Bessborough had another conversation with Thompson. The British Government was still active and Lord Bessborough used this as an argument for the independence of Canada. Thompson stated that it was impossible for Great Britain to force independence on them. In September, 1930, Thompson again repeated this statement and announced by saying that Canada had become a dominion. He connected this with the statement that even to the extent of providing for the independence of the Dominion of India, to a greater vote of the people of the Dominion. "Independence", he added, "means no-thing. They are one and the same thing."

In a conversation, Nov. 3, 1930, the Russian Minister suggested to Lord Bessborough the Franco-British war and British an opportunity to come to power for a settlement.

L. E. Adams, "The Theory of 'Independence' in the 19th Century and Other Essays", pp. 100-101.

Two weeks later, in his annual message to Congress, President Grant incorporated a passage, drafted by Fish, to hasten action on the part of the British Government. He regretted to say that since Her Majesty's Government seemed unwilling to acknowledge its negligence, or its liability for the damages suffered by the United States during the war, "he recommended that the Government appoint a commission to investigate "the amount and the ownership of these several claims" on notice to the representative of British Government in Washington; and that the United States be authorized to settle these claims so that it should have the ownership of the private claims as well as the responsible control of all the demands against Great Britain; and that whenever the British Government desired a "full and friendly adjustment" of these claims, the United States would enter upon these considerations" with an earnest desire for a conclusion consistent with the honor and dignity of both nations."<sup>1</sup> Adams says that this was an intimation that the administration intended to make the matter a serious national issue, and the full meaning of it was not lost on the British Foreign Office.

On Jan. 9, 1871, Rose arrived in Washington. In the evening, he dined with Fish. After dinner, they began an informal conference, which lasted till two or

---

1. J. D. Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, Vol. 7, p. 102.





three in the morning. Rose was authorized by the British Government to state that, if it were acceptable to the United States Government, they would send out a commission to which all subjects could be referred. When Fish asked him if the British Government would be prepared to admit liability for Alabama Claims, Sir John said that Parliament would not support the Government on such a measure. Fish said that if Parliament would not make such an admission, it would be useless to appoint a commission as the Senate would never ratify a Treaty that didn't include such a statement. The following plan was then drafted as a basis for negotiations; an acknowledgment from England of the liability for the Alabama, and an expression of regret for what had taken place to disturb the relations of the two countries; that Great Britain should propose a commission for the settlement of the San Juan boundary, fisheries, and other Canadian questions, and that the United States should accede, provided that claims for the acts of the vessels should also be considered. The next day, Sir John communicated with the Foreign Office in London, and, on Jan. 11, 1871, gave the confidential memorandum, relating to the subjects to be discussed and the method of procedure, to Fish.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. J.C.B. Davis, Mr. Fish and The Alabama Claims, p 63;

Moore, International Arbitration, Vol. 1. pp. 521-522.





On January 15, Secretary Fish called on Sumner by appointment, presented Rose's memorandum to him, and asked his advice. Fish and Sumner were not on speaking terms, as a result of instructions, sent by Fish to Moran, acting as charge'd'affairs in London, in answer to a dispatch from Motley in regard to his dismissal. In this communication, Fish alluded to "an unnamed party as bitterly, personally, and vindictively hostile" to the President than whom none" would look with more scorn and contempt upon one who uses the words and assurances of friendship to cover a secret and determined purpose of hostility." <sup>1</sup> Sumner asked for time to consider the matter and Fish left. On the 17, Sumner sent him this memorandum, "The greatest trouble if not peril, being a constant source of anxiety and disturbance is from Fenianism which is excited by the British flag in Canada. Therefore, the withdrawal of the British flag can not be abandoned as a condition or preliminary of such a settlement, as is now proposed, to make the settlement complete; the withdrawal should be from this hemisphere including provinces and islands. No proposition for a joint commission should be entertained, unless a satisfactory <sup>2</sup> settlement is reasonably assured." It seemed as if Sumner intended to end the proposed negotiations, but Fish determined to ignore him and to effect a settle-

- 
1. E. L. Pierce, Personal Memoirs and Letters of Charles Sumner, Vol. 4, p.465; C. F. Adams, "The Treaty of Washington" in Lee At Appomattox And Other Papers, p.471.
  2. C. F. Adams, "The Treaty of Washington" in Lee At Appomattox And Other Papers. p.147.





ment against his opposition. He, therefore, held conferences with prominent senators of both parties, from whom he received pledges of support. On Jan. 24, he showed Rose Sumner's memorandum and said that Grant was determined to go through even if it involved a conflict with Sumner in the Senate.<sup>1</sup>

On February, 1, an agreement was reached to submit the Alabama claims and other differences between the two governments to an International Joint High Commission consisting of five commissioners on each side, which should by treaty provide for the settlement of all outstanding differences. On February 9, the Senate confirmed the five commissioners. Fish, Samuel Nelson, Justice of the Supreme Court, Robert Schenck, newly appointed minister to England, E. R. Hoar, Attorney-General at the beginning of Grant's administration, and George Williams, an ex-Senator from Chicago. The British members were Earle de Grey and Ripon, a member of Gladstone's cabinet, Sir Stafford Northcote, a Conservative, Sir Edward Thornton, British Minister at Washington, Professor Montague Bernard of Oxford University, and Sir John MacDonald, Premier of Canada. J. C. Bancroft Davis was the Secretary of the American Commission, while Lord Tenderden, under-secretary for foreign affairs, was the Secretary for the British Commissioners.<sup>2</sup>

- 
1. J. B. Moore, International Arbitrations, Vol. 1, pp. 528-530.
  2. J. B. C. Davis, Mr. Fish and the Alabama Claims, pp. 71-73.





On February 27, the Commissioners organized at Washington. Thirty-seven sessions were held. On May 8, the Commissioners signed a treaty, consisting of a preamble and forty-three articles. The British Government expressed regret for the escape of the Alabama and its depredations, and consented to refer the question of liability for American losses, caused thereby, to arbitration.<sup>1</sup> For the guidance of the arbitrators, the treaty laid down these three rules as to the duty of neutrals: First, to use due diligence to prevent the escape, arming or equipment, within its jurisdiction, of any vessel which it has reasonable grounds to believe is intended to cruise or carry on war against a Power with which it is at peace, and use due diligence to prevent departure from its jurisdiction of any vessel intended to cruise or carry on war, as above, such vessel having been especially adapted, in whole or in part, within such jurisdiction, to warlike use. Secondly, not to permit either belligerent to use its ports or waters as a basis for naval operations against each other, or for purposes of renewal or augmentation of military supplies or arms, or the recruitment of men. Thirdly, to exercise diligence in its own ports or waters and as to all persons within its jurisdiction, to prevent any violation<sup>2</sup> of the foregoing obligations and duties." Another

---

1. J. B. Moore, International Arbitrations, Vol. 1, p. 553.

2. Sir A. W. Ward and G. P. Gooch, The Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy, Vol. 3, pp. 68-69.



On February 2, the Commission presented a  
report to the President. It was a long and  
careful study of the situation, and it was  
the Commission's opinion that the United States  
should not become involved in the conflict.  
The Commission also recommended that the  
President should not send troops to the  
Philippines. The Commission's report was  
received by the President on February 2, and  
he accepted its recommendations. The  
President's decision was based on the  
Commission's report, and it was a wise  
decision. The United States should not  
become involved in the conflict, and the  
President should not send troops to the  
Philippines. The Commission's report was  
a valuable contribution to the President's  
decision-making process, and it was a  
wise decision.

1. U. S. Navy, International Law, Vol. 1, p. 103.
2. U. S. Navy, International Law, Vol. 1, p. 103.
3. U. S. Navy, International Law, Vol. 1, p. 103.

Tribunal of three commissioners, one to be appointed by each country, and one by both, was to decide all other claims that had arisen during the war. The United States was given free navigation of the St. Lawrence River forever, and Great Britain was given similar use of the Yukon, Porcupine and Stikine rivers. Great Britain granted us provisions necessary for the conduct of our fishing industry, and the United States conceded the free entre of fish oil and sea fish. The San Juan Channel was to be submitted to the decision<sup>1</sup> of the German Emperor.

On the reorganization of the Senate in March, 1871, Grant used his influence to secure Sumner's removal from the Chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee. The treaty was submitted to the Senate, May 10, and was ratified May 24, 1871 by a vote of 50 to 12. Sumner voted for ratification. The treaty really followed closely the ideas that he had expressed in his speech against the Johnson-Clarendon<sup>2</sup> Convention.

The Tribunal of Arbitration, consisting of representatives, appointed by the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, Italy, Switzerland, and Brazil, met at Geneva on Dec. 15, 1871. The British personnel consisted of Chief Justice Alexander Cockburn

---

1. Carl Fish, American Diplomacy, p. 347.

2. J. B. Moore, International Arbitrations, Vol. 1, pp. 553-554.





as arbitrator, Sir Roundell Palmer as counsel and Lord Tenterden as agent. The American arbitrator was Charles Francis Adams. Evarts, Cushing, and Waite comprised the counsel, and J. C. B. Davis was the American agent. The neutral arbitrators were Count Sclopis of Italy, Jacques Steampfli, President of the Swiss Confederation, and Baron d' Itajuto of Brazil.

When the Tribunal met at Geneva, the next year, the United States, greatly to the surprise of everybody, presented not only the direct claims for the damages inflicted by Confederate cruisers but also "indirect claims" for the losses sustained through the transfer of American shipping to foreign registry, for the prolongation of the war, and for increased rates of insurance. These demands had also been represented in England and were understood by the British negotiators to have been barred from the arbitration. Their appearance in the "American Case" caused a furious outbreak in England so that the government was forced to take steps toward withdrawing from the tribunal. But Fish had no desire to press these claims. They had been presented partly with a view to satisfying the extreme element of public opinion in the United States and partly for the purpose of having them passed upon finally by a judicial authority. Accordingly, at

---





the suggestion of Adams, the Tribunal announced June 19, 1872, that it would not consider these claims, and the consideration of the direct and individual claims proceeded.<sup>1</sup> The result was a verdict that Great Britain had failed in her duty as a neutral in connection with the Alabama, Florida, and the Shenendoah, and that for the losses incurred through these, the sum of fifteen and one half millions should be paid to the United States. The commission on other Civil War claims granted to British subjects two million dollars for injuries occasioned by the war. Two months later, the Emperor of Germany decided in our favor in connection with the channel through the straight of Juan de Fuca and gave us the islands that were in dispute.<sup>2</sup>

This was the most advanced step taken by any two nations, up to this time, for the successful adjustment of their disputes by judicial proceedings, and the results made a marked impression on European nations. The rules laid down as a guide for the conduct of neutrals are now regarded as binding on all nations.

---

1. C. F. Adams, "The Treaty of Washington" in Lee At Appomattox And Other Papers, pp. 188-191; J. F. Rhodes, History of the United States, Vol. 6. pp. 368-371.

2. Carl Fish, American Diplomacy, p. 348.



the suggestion of Adams, the British government was in  
1828, that it would not consider these claims, and the  
negotiation of the direct and indirect claims process  
was. The result was a verdict that Great Britain had  
failed in her duty as a neighbor in connection with the  
Alabama, Virginia, and the Pennsylvania, and that the  
James River and Potomac Rivers, the sum of fifteen and  
one half millions should be paid to the United States.  
The conclusion on other civil war claims granted to  
Great Britain was the million dollars for injuries  
suffered by the war. Two months later, the Emperor  
of Austria decided to pay \$200,000 in connection with  
the channel through the straits of Genoa to the sea and  
have the islands that were in dispute.

This was the most important step taken by any  
two nations, up to this time, for the first ex-  
haustment of their disputes by judicial process.  
and the results were a marked impression on European  
nations. The power laid down as a guide for the con-  
duct of nations and was regarded as binding on all  
nations.

- 
1. C. F. Adams, "The Treaty of Washington" in 1828
  2. Admiral and other papers, pp. 188-191; L. R. Nichols,
  3. History of the United States, Vol. 8, pp. 368-371.
  4. Carlisle, American Diplomacy, p. 368.

## PART III.

## CUBAN INTERVENTION.

In 1868 a rebellion, designed to secure Cuban independence, broke out in that island, but it had made little progress with the accession of President Grant. Because of the inhuman measures taken by the Spanish officials to crush this insurrection, the Cubans had enlisted the sympathy of many in the United States, especially in New York. On March 24, 1869, Dulces, the newly appointed Captain-General of Cuba, issued the following decree: "All vessels found in Cuban waters or on the high seas near to the island that have men, or munitions aboard to ferment an insurrection in the island, whatever their destination may be, shall be seized as enemies of Spain and be treated as pirates. And all persons in such vessels shall be seized and executed."<sup>1</sup> On April 1, another decree was issued to the effect that all property, held without the assent of the Spanish officials, would be confiscated, and "embargoed property" would be held and managed by an administrative council. This decree drove many to seek an asylum in the United States, where they formed Cuban Juntas, one of which became the headquarters for filibustering expeditions to Cuba. A later proclamation, issued on April 4, 1869.

---

1. F. E. Chadwick, The Relations Of The United States And Spain, Vol. 1, pp. 284-285.



CHINESE INTERVIEW

In 1945 a collection, consisting of various Chinese  
independents, broke out in the island, but it was  
made little progress with the exception of President  
Gong. Because of the financial resources taken by the  
Chinese officials to drive this construction, the  
Chinese had obtained the authority of many in the  
United States, especially in New York. On March 24,  
1953, Wilson, the newly appointed American Consul of  
China, issued the following notice: "All vessels found  
in Cuban waters or on the high seas near to the island  
and have not, on condition agreed to prevent an inter-  
vention in the island, whatever their destination may  
be, shall be seized as enemies of Spain and be treated  
as pirates. And all persons in such vessels shall be  
seized and executed." On April 1, another notice  
was issued to the effect that all property, which  
without the consent of the Chinese officials, would  
be confiscated, and "seized property" would be  
sold and removed by an administrative council. This  
notice drove many to seek an asylum in the United  
States, where they formed Cuban colonies, one of which  
formed the headquarters for filibustering expeditions  
to Cuba. A later proclamation, issued on April 1, 1954,  
by the United States, stated that the United States

at Bayamo, stated that any man, over fifteen, seized at a distance from his home, and unable to give a satisfactory reason for his presence in that locality, was to be shot; that every home, found unoccupied or on which a white flag was not displayed, should be burnt<sup>1</sup> by the troops.

The United States Government was an interested observer in the events taking place, as it was incumbent on it to protect the lives and interests of its citizens against the disorders and against the confiscatory decrees of the Spanish officials. President Grant was openly sympathetic with the insurgents and wished to accord them the belligerent rights which the Cuban Juntas and public sentiment were urging. But Fish was at that moment pressing the Alabama Claims against England, and the policy which he had to frame would have to be applicable to both situations. Furthermore, he and Sumner felt that it would be unwise to extend the belligerent status to the insurgents as they didn't satisfy the conditions necessary for such recognition. But while Sumner wished to see such action side-tracked, Fish wished to leave the way open for intervention if it became necessary.

In correspondence with the Spanish Minister, in April, 1869, he protested against the decrees issued by the Spanish officials in derogation of the rights guar-

---

1. F. E. Chadwick, The Relations Of The United States And Spain, Vol. 1. pp. 284-285.



at present, stated that they had been told that the  
distance from the house, and that it was a matter of  
fact, however, for the purpose of the investigation, was  
to be a fact; and very soon, found themselves in the  
fact that the fact was not as alleged, and that the

of the groups.

The United States Government was an interest-

of interest in the events taking place, as it was  
interested in it to protect the lives and interests  
of the citizens against the interests and actions  
of the legislative branch of the United States.

President Grant was greatly surprised with the in-

formation and asked to know what the information meant  
and the United States and the United States were being  
the fact was at that moment the United States

and the United States, and the policy which was to be

would have to be applicable to both situations, and the

fact, as the United States felt that it would be easier to ex-

plain the political situation to the interests as they

and it is really the condition necessary for such con-

ditions, and the United States is the same action

and the United States, and the United States is the same

intervention if it becomes necessary.

to correct the situation with the United States, is

April, 1863, and the United States is the same

the United States is the same

J. W. E. Johnson, The Relations of the United States

and Spain, Vol. I, 1864-1865.

anted to American citizens in the treaty of 1795, and called attention to the fact that the right of seizure on the high seas was limited solely to contraband articles, destined for the "enemies of Spain". He hoped that the proclamation, in so far as it affected American citizens, would be withdrawn, otherwise the cordial relations which the President wished to maintain would be endangered."<sup>1</sup>

In his instruction to Sickles, our Minister in Spain, on June 29, 1869, Fish offered to mediate between the Spanish Government and the Rebels, on the basis of independence and the abolition of slavery. He called attention to the havoc wrought in the island, to the deplorable loss of life, and to the hostility evinced by the people to Spanish rule. He said that in view of the injuries to the citizens, and large "property interests" of the United States, of "our friendship for Spain, and our sympathy for the Cubans," we had been impelled to offer our good offices. In a confidential note, which accompanied this message, Fish advised Sickles to accept the proposal-that the United States Government might find it necessary to recognize the belligerency of the parties, unless conditions changed.<sup>2</sup>

- 
1. Joseph V. Fuller, "Hamilton Fish" in The American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy, Vol. 7, p. 138.  
Ibid. p. 139.





Marshall Prim expressed willingness to grant self-government, but Spanish politics prevented the Government from accepting the terms. The Spanish Government then outlined a program laying down these conditions as the preliminary to any settlement: the disarming of the Cubans, the submission of the question of independence to a popular vote of the Cubans, a general amnesty to be issued by Spain, and the accordance of independence, if such be the popular vote, the Cortes consenting. An exchange of notes followed, in an attempt<sup>1</sup> at compromise. The United States' attempt at mediation proved ineffective, due to difficulties raised by the Cortes and the Spanish Government. Reenforcements to suppress the revolt were sent to the island but promises of reforms were made.

In the midst of the negotiations, the insurgents made an appeal to the United States Government and succeeded in winning General Rawlins, Secretary of War, and Grant's loyal friend, to their cause. Under his influence, Grant signed a proclamation, Aug. 19, 1896, in the cabin of the Fall River boat, recognizing the insurgents as belligerents, and intrusted it to Bancroft Davis, the Assistant Secretary of State, to take it to Washington, with a note to Fish requesting

---

1. F. E. Chadwick. The Relations of the United States and Spain, Vol. 1, p. 295.





him to sign, seal, and issue it. Fish, however, saw that the President's sympathy had betrayed him into making a mistake, so he put the paper in a safe place and awaited the outcome. Rawlins died a short time after this incident and Grant never referred to the subject again except to thank Fish, a year later, for having refused to issue it.<sup>1</sup> Meanwhile, Babcock had signed a protocol for the annexation of San Domingo, Sept. 4, and Fish offered Grant his support for the treaty in return; for which, Grant gave him a free hand in the Cuban and English controversies. Grant's message showed that the policy of Fish was to prevail. He disapproved intervention in quarrels between European Countries and their colonies, even though our sympathy would be with those struggling for independence. He said that the United States Government reserved for itself, however, the right to decide when belligerency should be accorded to the Cuban insurgents, but it did not believe that a<sup>2</sup> "de facto political organization" existed there.

In his special message, June 13, 1870, the President reported that there had been no progress made on either side in the Cuban struggle, and that both were guilty of the same outrages and atrocities.

---

1. C. F. Adams, "The Treaty of Washington" in Lee At Appomattox And Other Papers, p. 119.

2. J. D. Richardson, Messages and Papers Of The Presidents, Vol. 7, p. 32.





He expressed indignation at those Cubans who were making war from the United States thus "embroiling our government in difficulties with Spain."

"I am unable to see", he said", in the present condition of the contest in Cuba the elements which are requisite to constitute war in the sense of International Law. The insurgents hold no town or city, have no established seat of government, no prize courts; no organization for receiving or collecting revenue; no seaports to which a prize may be carried, or through which access can be had by a foreign power to the limited interior territory, and mountain fastnesses which they occupy.--- There is no evidence of an election of any delegated authority or of any government outside the limits of camps, occupied from day to day, by roving companies of insurgent troops; no commerce, no trade, either internal or foreign, and no manufactures. Recognition by a foreign state of belligerent rights to the insurgents, under such conditions, is a demonstration of moral support to the rebellion".<sup>1</sup>

On January 31, 1870, a joint resolution granting belligerent rights had been introduced into the House and, on February 11, into the Senate. Three days after the message of the President, the resolu-

---

1. J. D. Richardson, Messages and Papers, of the Presidents. Vol. 7. pp.65-67.





tion passed the House but was defeated in the Senate.

In spite of the promises made by the Spanish Government in 1870, American lives and interest still continued to be threatened by the disorders; so Fish dispatched a communication to Sickles to call the Spanish government's attention to these grievances and to impress upon her that if she continued to postpone redressing these wrongs that she would find a marked change in the attitude of "the people and Government of the United States". But all contemplated action was again postponed in 1873 by the abdication<sup>1</sup> of the King and the formation of a republic.

When the Republic was established, Fish promptly recognized it. Although new promises were made, the customary delay was encountered and Fish was exasperated. On March 21, he protested against the custom fines imposed in Cuba but this protest went unheeded. On April 23, he complained of the inability of the Government to control authorities in Cuba who refused to honor the promises of the Spanish Government. On Aug. 27, he urged the repeal of the law giving the power of suspension of the measures of the home Government to the Captain-General.

---

1. Foreign Relations- Oct. 29, 1872.



tion passed the House and was referred to the Senate.  
In effect of the provisions made for the Spanish  
Government in 1890, American money and property still  
continued to be transferred by the Government; so that  
disappeared a communication to Mexico to call the  
Spanish Government's attention to these references  
and to request them not to let the continued to  
continue transferring funds through them and would find  
a marked change in the attitude of the people and  
Government of the United States. And all contemplated  
action was again postponed in 1893 by the expiration  
of the time and the expiration of a treaty.  
From the details and established. With regard  
to the situation in 1893, the Government was aware that the  
Spanish Government was not prepared to give up the  
money. In 1893, the Government again the question  
then passed in both the House and Senate went unpassed.  
On April 22, the completion of the treaty of the  
Government to control authority in Cuba was postponed  
to show the progress of the Spanish Government, on  
April 2, the House and Senate of the law giving the  
power of suspension of the transfer of the money  
Government to the Cuban-Government.

On October 15, he threatened to join with the anti-slavery Republicans to carry on war for the freedom of Cuba. On the very day this protest was made, the first fruitful sign of reform was seen when the Spanish Government repealed the noxious decree of 1825, granting power of suspension to the Captain-General.<sup>1</sup>

Early in July 1869, the President granted a commission to the District-Attorney and the Marshall of the Southern district of New York, empowering them to employ United States forces to observe neutrality. In his special message of June 13, 1870, he had alluded to the filibustering operations of the Cuban revolutionary committee in New York, financed by Americans. In spite of the best intentions of the government, some of these were successful.

On Oct. 31, 1870, the *Virginus*, for some time engaged in work of this nature, was captured on the high seas between Jamaica and Cuba, flying the American flag, and carrying contraband, and 155 passengers and crew, including some Americans. Orders, sent by the Spanish Government to impose no death penalty without authorization of the Cortes, were delayed in transmission, and between November 4th and 8th, fifty-three of those captured, including the captain and thirty-six of the crew, among whom were eight Americans, were

---

1. J. V. Fuller, "Hamilton Fish" in The American Secretaries of State And Their Diplomacy. Vol. 7, pp. 179-181.





court-martialed and shot. On Nov. 14, Sickles, our Minister in Spain, made demands on the Spanish Government for the surrender of the *Virginus* and the persons taken on board, a salute to the United States flag, and for the punishment of those officials that were responsible for the seizure and the executions within twelve days, or the legation in Madrid would<sup>1</sup> be closed.

On Nov. 15, hearing from our Acting-Consul General that there were reports that fifty-seven more prisoners had been executed, Fish advised Sickles to cautiously warn the Spanish Government that "if Spain could not redress the outrages, perpetrated in her name in Cuba, the United States would". These rumors were later learned to be without foundation and Fish so communicated to Sickles, but the latter had been carried away by war hysteria and all his later dispatches were "inflammatory".<sup>2</sup>

Popular feeling was at a high pitch in both countries. On Nov. 17, a mass meeting was held in New York, by the Cuban junta, at which speeches, demanding action by the Administration were endorsed. On the following day, a demonstration took place in

---

1. Foreign Relations, 1874, pp. 927-936.

2. J. F. Rhodes, History of the United States, Vol. 7. p. 34.



count-estimated and that, on Nov. 12, 1934, our

initial is Spain, who demands on the Spanish Govern-

ment for the surrender of the Virginians and the

same taken on board, a salute to the United States

flag, and for the punishment of those responsible

with responsibility for the seizure and the execution

of the vessel, or the location is desired would

be closed.

On Nov. 12, received from our sister-Correspondence

and that there were reports that fifty-seven

passengers had been executed, which advised officials to

immediately send the Spanish Government that it

could not release the country, as requested in the

case in Cuba, the United States would. These reports

were later learned to be without foundation and with

an acknowledgment to Mexico, but the latter has been

carried away by her hysteria and officials later dis-

2

patches were "indefinite".

For the feeling was at a high pitch in both

countries. On Nov. 17, a mass meeting was held

in New York by the Cuban World, at which address,

declaring action by the administration was urged.

On the following day, a demonstration took place in

1. Foreign Relations, 1934, pp. 22-23.

2. U. S. Mexico, History of the United States, Vol.

p. 22.

1.

Madrid before the United States legation.

On November 18, the Spanish Minister informed Sickles that the Government was investigating the status of the *Virginus*, and, consequently, could not agree to salute the flag, until it was proved that she had the right to fly it. Sickles regarded this communication as a refusal to make reparation, and prepared to close the legation, although the time set had not expired. But, on the same date, Fish received word through the Spanish legation in Washington that the Spanish Government would make full reparation as soon as the evidence was established. He then telegraphed Sickles to delay his departure until November 26, as an extension of time for "ascertaining facts" was reasonable, and Admiral Polo, the Spanish Minister, had been informed that a satisfactory settlement would be reached on that date. Sickles now urged his departure, as a means of forcing Spain's actions, but again Fish, after consulting with the President, ordered him to remain at his post and withdrew the negotiations to Washington.

2

On Nov. 24, Admiral Polo offered a proposal to arbitrate, but this was rejected as "inapplicable to a question of National honor". On the evening of the

---

1. J. F. Rhodes, History of the United States, Vol. 7.  
pp. 31-35; J. V. Fuller, "Hamilton Fish" in The American Secretaries of State And Their Diplomacy,  
Vol. 7, p. 184.

2. J. F. Rhodes, History of the United States, Vol. 7,  
p. 36.



Smith before the United States Supreme Court.

On November 12, the United States Supreme Court

decided that the Government was lawfully entitled to

search of the telephone records, and, consequently, could not

claim that the search was illegal, and that the search was

not the right to the telephone records, and that the search

was not a violation of the Fourth Amendment, and that the

search was lawful, and that the search was not a

violation of the Fourth Amendment, and that the search

was lawful, and that the search was not a

violation of the Fourth Amendment, and that the search

was lawful, and that the search was not a

violation of the Fourth Amendment, and that the search

was lawful, and that the search was not a

violation of the Fourth Amendment, and that the search

was lawful, and that the search was not a

violation of the Fourth Amendment, and that the search

was lawful, and that the search was not a

violation of the Fourth Amendment, and that the search

was lawful, and that the search was not a

2

violation of the Fourth Amendment.

On Nov. 12, the United States Supreme Court

decided that the Government was lawfully entitled to

search of the telephone records, and that the search

was lawful, and that the search was not a

violation of the Fourth Amendment, and that the search

was lawful, and that the search was not a

Vol. 1, p. 184.

U. S. Supreme Court, 359 U.S. 127, 1959.

U. S. Supreme Court, 359 U.S. 127, 1959.

25th, Fish cabled Sickles to ask for his passports if no adjustment, or further proposal, had been received by the next day. On the 26th, he requested the Italian Government to take over our legation. Sickles, although he had asked for his passports, agreed to a postponement, until he could obtain an answer to a new note received from the Spanish Government, agreeing to all of the demands, if, by December 25, the illegality of Virgin-  
ius' registry had not been proved. On Nov. 27, Admiral Polo, who had been empowered by his government to offer the immediate surrender of the ship and men, called on Fish. The latter, thinking that Sickles had left Madrid, and that this would probably be the greatest concession that Spain would make, consulted with Grant and then agreed to settle on the basis proposed; and unless it was proved that the Virginus was carrying a false regis-  
try, Spain would salute the flag on December 25.<sup>1</sup>

On November 28, Sickles, thinking that the Government had refused the latest proposals, again asked for his passports. He had been advised that the Spanish Government was preparing to yield and he felt that we might secure "unconditional demands". But Fish had already made his agreement with Polo, and so he informed Sickles that the "unconditional negotiations" must stop and ordered him to remain at his post and await in-  
structions.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Foreign Relations, 1874, pp. 970, 987

2. J. V. Fuller, "Hamilton Fish" in The American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy. Vol. 7, p. 187.





On Nov. 29, the protocol for the settlement of the question had been completed and was transmitted to Congress on Dec. 1. On the eighth, the arrangements for the surrender of the vessel and men were made, and on the sixteenth, the *Virginius* was delivered to the American Navy at Bahi Honda, Cuba. On her journey to New York, she sank in a storm. The survivors were<sup>1</sup> taken to New York in safety.

On December 17, Attorney-General Williams decided "that the *Virginius* at the time of her capture was without right, and improperly carrying the American flag", so the salute to the flag was dispensed with. But the question of the indemnity for the executions<sup>1</sup> and punishment of the officials remained unsettled.<sup>2</sup>

On Dec. 20, Sickles, who felt that Fish had concluded the *Virginius* settlement over his head, on less advantageous terms than he could have secured, resigned and Caleb Cushing, a "diplomatist of proved ability", a trusted adviser of Fish, and agreeable to Spain, because he opposed filibustering, was appointed. Cushing's instructions called for a more rigorous solution of the grievances suffered at the hands of Spanish officials. He was to say that 'although we preferred independence,

- 
1. Foreign Relations, 1874, pp. 970-987; J.F. Rhodes, History of the United States. Vol. 7, p. 36
  2. J. D. Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents. Vol. 7, pp. 257-258.





we were willing to accept self government under Spain accompanied by the emancipation of the slaves; that the President regarded these two as necessary solutions of the problem; and that the United States had no ulterior motive in Cuba. He was then directed to urge the release of the embargoed estates, and to formulate a plan on the basis of which he should demand reparations for the deaths and mistreatment of American citizens in the case of the Virginus". But as partial arrangements effected with Great Britain in regard to British subjects on the Virginus were involved, no settlement was reached 'till March 9, and then with the new government under Alfonso XII. By agreement, the sum of \$80.000 was paid in full by May 5. Efforts to have the Spanish authorities punished, however, were evaded, and the questions of embargoed estates and the trial of American citizens by court-martial, when a state of war was non-existent, were still outstanding when the ministry fell.<sup>1</sup>

On October 1, Fish suggested that Great Britain cooperate with us in effecting a settlement. On the same date, a message was sent to Spain that the patience of the United States was well-nigh exhausted and that, unless she redressed the wrongs done to American citizens Congress might be forced to take up the question of

---

1. J. V. Fuller, "Hamilton Fish" in The American Secretaries of State And Their Diplomacy. Vol. 7. pp. 190-191



be made difficult to conduct self government and to remain  
accompanied by the recognition of the state; that the  
independent nations there two as a necessary condition of  
the problem and that the United States had no intention  
active in Cuba. It was then suggested that the release  
of the captured estates, and to maintain a plan on the  
basis of which to make a second reservation for the people  
and to maintain an American citizen for the sake of the  
"nationality" and as a result of the experience of the  
last century in regard to political subjects on the Vir-  
ginia side involved, no additional was needed still  
much it, and then with the government which citizens  
in a B. agreement, the sum of \$50,000 was paid in full  
by the B. citizens to have the same authorities con-  
sidered, however, were stated, and the question of a  
national subject and the trial of political citizens by  
court-martial, when a state of war was non-existent,  
were still outstanding when the military bill.  
On October 1, 1911, it was suggested that when the bill  
concerning the military bill was introduced, on the same  
date, a message was sent to the House that the citizens of  
the United States was no longer considered and that, ac-  
cording to the proposed law should have no political citizens  
thereafter right to be forced to take on the question of  
I. W. V. Wilson, "Hamilton" in the National Bureau  
of Statistics and Social Dynamics, Vol. 1, pp. 100-101

intervention. Naval preparations, due to pressure exerted by those interested, and sympathetic to the Cuban insurgents, were now begun. Fish and the Cabinet favored direct action rather than by conceding belligerency. As he foresaw that American intervention in Spanish Colonial affairs might be viewed with suspicion by the European powers, he decided to present to them the American side of the case. Therefore he resolved to seek the cooperation of the British Government which had acted in unison with us in protesting against slavery, and the excessive customs' fines in Cuba. But, before the plan could be carried out, the Spanish Government, on Nov. 15, 1875, sent a conciliatory note meeting all of our demands. After much deliberation, Fish decided that he would proceed with his original plan, and Schenck was ordered to present the note asking for the cooperation of Great Britain. When Lord Derby was notified concerning the Spanish note of Nov. 15, he stated that his Government could not cooperate in any proposals, unacceptable to Spain.

In his message of Dec. 7, 1875, the President again rejected the proposal for the recognition of belligerency on independence for Cuba and stated that it was his firm belief that if the conduct didn't soon cease, the European

---

1. J. V. Fuller, "Hamilton Fish" in The American Secretaries of State And Their Diplomacy. Vol. 7, pp.193-195.





nations would be compelled to intervene. He said that what the United States Government wanted was the end of hostilities in the island on the basis of independence, or self government and emancipation, not empty promises impossible of fulfilment.<sup>1</sup>

As later appeals to the British and other European Governments brought forth no satisfactory response to our notes of January 25, 1826, it was now clear to Fish that, if Congress intervened and hostilities broke out, the European Governments would be found aligned on the side of Spain. Moreover, he was being censured at home for attempting to make European alliances, and Congress called for the correspondence in two resolutions. This it never debated, as it was investigating scandals in the Administration. Fish decided to "let the matter rest," and secure from Spain as satisfactory a settlement as possible. When he was asked what he wanted, he said, "A satisfactory understanding as to the right of persons and property under existing treaties, administrative reforms in Cuba in the direction of self government, emancipation, and improved commercial facilities. These demands were fairly well adjusted. The question of trials by court-martial was settled Feb. 4, 1877, by a provision which

---

1. J. D. Richardson, Messages And Papers Of the Presidents. Vol. 7, pp. 336-340.





entitled American citizens to be tried only before civilian tribunals, unless taken with arms in hand, and even then to be acquainted with the accusation and to be allowed counsel and an appeal. Thus, when Fish gave up his office, the Cuban problem was well on<sup>1</sup> its way to a solution.

- 
1. J. V. Fuller, "Hamilton Fish" in The American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy. Vol. 7, pp. 200-201.



qualified members of the bar to be tried only before  
civilian tribunals, which taken with some in hand,  
and even then to be acquainted with the necessities  
and to be able to counsel and to answer. Thus, when  
this came to the office, the Cuban problem was still in  
on its way to a solution.

---

U. S. Police, "American Life" in the American  
Government, State and Social Democracy, Vol. 6,  
pp. 200-201.

## PART IV.

## PROJECT FOR SAN DOMINGO ANNEXATION.

In 1844, San Domingo secured its independence from Haiti, which occupied the western end of the island, and established itself as an independent republic. But its liberty was threatened by frequent revolutions, instigated by reckless and selfish adventurers who seized the power and proceeded to squander the revenues.

In 1868, Baez, an unprincipled adventurer, became the President by means of a revolution, but his position was precarious, as his rival, Cabral, held out against him with a military force. Lacking troops and money, and fearful that he would be overthrown, he sent agents to the United States, offering to sell his country rather than to see the power<sup>1</sup> pass into the hands of his rival.

Grant had territorial expansion in mind from the beginning of his administration and, once his mind was made up, it was difficult to restrain him from his purpose. His mind conceived a United States, enlarged by outlying possessions, acquired through treaty or purchase. He felt that the absorption of small peoples would bestow un-numbered blessings upon them, secure

---

1. E. L. Pierce, Personal Memoirs and Letters of Charles Sumner, Vol. 4. p. 427.



## PROJECT FOR AN AMERICAN ASSOCIATION.

In 1811, an expedition under the command of  
 Gen. Belknap, with a small force, was sent to the  
 island, and established itself as an independent  
 political entity. It was recognized by the  
 revolutionaries, and by the British and American  
 governments, and it proceeded to establish  
 its own government.

In 1808, Gen. Belknap, an experienced adventurer,  
 became the proprietor of a small island, and  
 his activities as a revolutionary, in his time, General,  
 and his efforts to establish a military force, leading  
 to the loss of his property, and the loss of his  
 property and money, and General Belknap, offering  
 to sell his property and his island to the British  
 government, and the British government, offering  
 to sell his property and his island to the British  
 government, and the British government, offering

to sell his property and his island to the British  
 government, and the British government, offering  
 to sell his property and his island to the British  
 government, and the British government, offering  
 to sell his property and his island to the British  
 government, and the British government, offering  
 to sell his property and his island to the British  
 government, and the British government, offering  
 to sell his property and his island to the British  
 government, and the British government, offering  
 to sell his property and his island to the British  
 government, and the British government, offering

J. E. Belknap, General, and others of

General Belknap, No. 1, p. 10.

economic advantages to us, and promote universal peace. His interest in San Domingo was honorable, but his policy was influenced, undoubtedly, to a great extent by American speculators and gamblers, who, having acquired concessions under Baez, were anxious to extend over them the protection of a strong government, so that their value might be enhanced. In a letter to Mr. Jacob Rich, Jan. 9, 1870, Senator Grimes wrote, "Was there ever such an outrage as the attempt to foist upon the country in the interest of the corruptionists, the annexation of San Domingo? This purchase was on the carpet when I was in New York last month, two years ago, and I was advised with about it. A friend asked my advice as to investing money in the public debt, in buying up Baez, etc. and I dissuaded him from it."<sup>1</sup> The Navy Department was especially interested in the proposition on account of the favorable situation of the Bay of Samana as a Naval Station.

From time to time, Fish remarked that he was being constantly annoyed with suggestions for the annexation of San Domingo by one Fabens, a representative of the Baez Government, who was then in Washington supposedly, for the purchase of the old arms in our arsenals. The Cabinet discussion had been free and the general impression prevailed that the administration was opposed to annexation. Fish believed that there should

---

1. William Salter, Life of Grimes, p. 379.



economic advantages to us, and through our special needs.  
His interest in San Domingo was honorable, but his self-  
ish was influenced, undoubtedly, to a great extent by  
western speculators and capitalists, who, having secured  
connections under Spain, were anxious to extend their  
power the possession of a better government, so that  
their wealth might be increased. In a letter to "L'Union"  
Paris, Jan. 4, 1846, Senator Fieschi writes, "I have been every-  
where on our way as the attempt to take upon the country  
in the interest of the nationalists, the annihilation of  
San Domingo. This purchase was on the part of Spain. I was  
in New York last month, two weeks ago, and I was advised  
that a bill, a friend asked my advice as to its action  
in the Senate. In the Senate, in passing the bill, and I  
disapproved the bill. The Navy Department was un-  
likely to be passed in the proposition on account of the  
favorable opinion of the Secretary of the Navy.  
Station.  
From this it is plain that the bill  
which Congress has passed with amendments for the  
acquisition of San Domingo by one branch, a representative  
of the House of Representatives, who was then in Washington sug-  
gesting, for the purpose of the bill, in our hands  
the bill. The Cabinet discussed the bill then and the  
general impression was that the administration  
was opposed to annexation. This bill was then passed.

be cordial relations with the Government of San Domingo, and that intervention and filibustering should be discouraged.

One day, Grant remarked, at a cabinet meeting, that he thought he would send his private secretary, Colonel Orville Babcock, to examine Samana Bay, as the Navy Department wished to make it a coaling station. Babcock was a young army officer, who had been on Grant's military staff in the war and had been retained as his assistant private secretary. While the Cabinet did not welcome this suggestion, because they foresaw complications, they offered no objection.

At a later meeting, and just before Babcock's departure, Grant remarked that New York merchants, who controlled the shipping trade with the island, had offered their ship to Babcock. Fish advised that it would be undesirable for him to be the guest of the merchants, while on a confidential investigation for the President, so Grant said that he would direct the Navy to give him transportation. Day by day, the uneasiness of the Cabinet increased, as rumors spread that business speculations were involved, and that the official character of the investigation was but a  
1  
pretense.

In July, Babcock set forth on his mission under instructions, signed by Fish, for inquiry into the population and the resources of the island, etc. Secretary Robeson ordered the warship to give Babcock "the moral



of official relations with the Government of the District  
and case intervention and intervention should be dis-  
continued.

On the 21st, 1941, at a public meeting, that  
the Government of the District should be dis-  
continued. The meeting was held at the New  
York Public Library, 410 Madison Avenue, New York  
City, on the 21st, 1941, at 8:00 P.M. The  
meeting was held at the New York Public Library,  
410 Madison Avenue, New York City, on the 21st,  
1941, at 8:00 P.M. The meeting was held at the  
New York Public Library, 410 Madison Avenue, New  
York City, on the 21st, 1941, at 8:00 P.M.

At a later meeting, and last before the  
meeting, the meeting was held at the New York  
Public Library, 410 Madison Avenue, New York  
City, on the 21st, 1941, at 8:00 P.M. The  
meeting was held at the New York Public Library,  
410 Madison Avenue, New York City, on the 21st,  
1941, at 8:00 P.M. The meeting was held at the  
New York Public Library, 410 Madison Avenue, New  
York City, on the 21st, 1941, at 8:00 P.M.

In July 1941, the meeting was held at the  
New York Public Library, 410 Madison Avenue, New  
York City, on the 21st, 1941, at 8:00 P.M.

support of its guns", and by a telegram, on August 23, he ordered another to place itself at Babcock's disposal. On September 4, Babcock executed with the Dominican authorities a protocol, stipulating for the annexation of San Domingo to the United States for one million and a half, which was "to be used for the liquidation debt". To these terms, he added the pledge that "his Excellency, General Grant, President of the United States, promises privately to use all his influence in order that the idea of annexation of the Dominican Republic to the United States may acquire such a degree of popularity among members of Congress, as will be necessary for its accomplishment." In the body of the protocol, Babcock assumed the title of "Aide-de-camp to his Excellency, Ulysses S. Grant, President of the United States of America".<sup>1</sup>

At the next meeting of the Cabinet, the members found the table loaded with specimens of ores and products from the island. Babcock presented himself and attempted to expatiate on the extraordinary value of the island, but not receiving any encouragement, he left the room. Grant then alluded to the treaty, remarking "that he supposed it wasn't legal as Babcock had not been delegated any diplomatic powers but that it could be remedied by having it sent back to Perry, the Consular-agent

---

1. E. L. Pierce, Personal Memoirs and Letters of Charles Sumner, Vol. 4, pp. 429-430.



...of its own", and by a ...

...and ...

...on ...

...and ...

...of ...

...and ...

...tion ...

...the ...

...address, ...

...order that ...

...rights in ...

...of ...

...necessary for ...

...proposed, ...

...his ...

...United States ...

...

At the next ...

...found ...

...agreement ...

...attached to ...

...island, ...

...no ...

...he ...

...stated ...

...also by ...

...

...

...

to sign it." When Cox asked the President if it had been definitely decided to annex San Domingo, Grant glanced at Fish and then at Boutwell, but meeting with an ominous silence, he <sup>1</sup>changed the subject.

Although the members of the Cabinet and Congress had been urged to make no issue with Grant, for fear of the effect on the country, Fish felt embarrassed because the treaty had been negotiated without his knowledge, "and finding his position intolerable, he tendered his resignation." But Grant would not accept it remarking, <sup>2</sup>"my wife and I need you and your wife." Rhodes says, "there must have been a tacit bargain between the two that in return for this assistance (remaining in the Cabinet and supporting his Dominican policy), the Secretary should have practically a free hand in the Cuban and English matters." <sup>3</sup>

In November, Babcock returned to San Domingo to put the treaty in diplomatic form. On December 3, he concluded two treaties, one, for the annexation of San Domingo, and the other, for the lease of the Bay of Samana. Pending the ratification of the treaties, Babcock pledged that the President would send warships <sup>4</sup>to Dominican waters to sustain Baez.

---

1. J. D. Cox, Atlantic Monthly, p. 167

2. W. E. Woodward, Meet General Grant, p. 443

3. J. F. Rhodes, History Of The United States, Vol. 6. p. 349.

4. W. E. Woodward, Meet General Grant, p. 444.





With three armed vessels at his disposal, Babcock proceeded to take possession of the Bay of Samana in the name of the United States, raise the United States flag, and place a guard with it. He then directed the commander of one of the warships to carry out the pledge against intervention. During 1870, twelve different ships were hovering in the waters of San Domingo ready to suppress any revolt against Baez. In Feb. 1870, Admiral Poor visited the President of Haiti and, in the course of the interview, announced that any attack on Baez would be viewed as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition to the United States and would provoke retaliation. The Haitian President and Secretary of State said they hoped, "friendly relations now existing between the two countries would not be interrupted, "and that while "they were aware of their weakness, they knew their rights and would maintain them and their dignity as far as they were able, and that they must be allowed to be the judges of their own policy."<sup>1</sup> Meanwhile, Babcock, having finished his business, returned to Washington with the treaties.

One evening in January, 1870, Grant called on Sumner to ask his assistance in securing ratification of the treaty in the Senate. As Sumner stated that he had not seen the treaty, Grant promised to send the documents to him by Babcock. Several times during the interview, he addressed Sumner as Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to Sumner's annoyance. As Grant was leaving,

---

1. E. L. Pierce, Personal Memoirs and Letters of Charles Sumner, pp. 430-432.



With these armed vessels at his disposal, Johnson

proceeded to take possession of the Bay of Amman in

the name of the United States, raised the United States

flag, and placed a garrison within it. He then directed the

commander of one of the vessels to carry out the plans

against intervention. During 1870, twelve American ships

were hovering in the waters of San Pedro de Macoris in sup-

press any revolt against Spain. In Feb. 1870, Johnson

took aboard the President of Haiti and, in the course

of the interview, announced that his mission on San Pedro

was viewed as a manifestation of an entirely different

kind to the United States and would involve no action.

The latter President and Secretary of State said they

would. "I think," Johnson now declared before the two

countries would not be interrupted, "and that while they

would remain in the hands of the Spaniards, they have their rights and

would remain in the hands of the Spaniards as long as they were

able, and that they would be allowed to be the judges of

their own policy. Johnson, however, would not

be satisfied, returned to Washington with the President.

Now coming in January, 1870, Johnson called on

Johnson to ask his assistance in securing recognition

of the treaty in the United States. As Johnson stated that he

had not seen the treaty, Grant promised to send the docu-

ments to him by Johnson. Johnson, however, during the inter-

view, he advised Johnson as Chairman of the Judiciary

Committee, to present a bill. As Johnson was leaving,

J. E. L. Johnson, Personal Memoirs and Papers of Johnson

Sumner said, "Mr. President, I am an Administration man, and whatever you do will always find in me the most careful and candid consideration."<sup>1</sup> The President afterward maintained that Sumner had pledged his support and was guilty of bad faith.

On January 18, Sumner laid the treaty before the Committee on Foreign Relations. Morton was the only one who said anything favorable about it. On March 15, the Committee made an adverse report on ratification. Grant now became more determined than ever in his purpose, and two days later visited the Senate and interviewed fourteen Senators. In the meanwhile, rumors that Baez was being sustained in power by the American Navy reached Sumner, who, on hastening to the Navy Department, found them confirmed. On March 24, Sumner opened the debate in the secret session with an attack on the treaty. The following day, Grant, appeared at the Capitol, "summoning Senators from the floor, taking them into Committee rooms and out of the way corners, buttonholing them to vote for the Grant-Baez Treaty."<sup>2</sup> Morton fought hard for the Treaty, but the opposition had been too thoroughly organized by Sumner and Schurz.<sup>3</sup> Two weeks before the vote, Fish visited Sumner and argued with him to support the Treaty. At last, he said to Sumner, "Why not go to London? I offer you the English mission; it is yours."

---

1. Charles Sumner, Works, Vol. 14, pp. 125-126

2. New York World, Mar. 26, 1870

3. Schurz's Reminiscences, Vol. 3. p. 325.



Sumner said, "Mr. President, I am an abolitionist  
man, and whatever you do will always find in me the  
most careful and candid consideration." The presi-  
dent afterward said that Sumner had changed his  
speech and was really of the right.

On January 15, Sumner said that it was before the  
Committee on Foreign Relations. Sumner was the only one  
who said anything favorable about it. On March 10, the  
Committee made an address in regard to the resolution. Grant  
had become more distrustful than ever in his opinion, and  
had later stated that Sumner and his friends were  
too dangerous. In the meanwhile, Sumner had been  
kept out of the way by the Republican Party, and  
Sumner, who, according to the New York Herald, "looked  
down contemptuously on the whole lot," Sumner changed his habits in  
the matter. Sumner also had a attack on the treaty. The 101-  
year old, Grant, appeared at the Senate, "summoning  
Sumner from the floor, telling him that Sumner's name  
was one of the very names, notwithstanding that he was the  
"Grand-Bass Treaty." Sumner fought hard for the treaty,  
but the opposition had been too completely organized by  
Sumner and Sumner. Two weeks before the vote, Sumner  
Sumner and argued with him so much that the treaty, at last,  
he said to Sumner, "Why not go to England? I often see the  
British minister in London."

1. Charles Sumner, Works, vol. 14, pp. 125-126.
2. Sumner's Works, vol. 14, pp. 125, 126.
3. Sumner's Works, vol. 14, pp. 125.

Sumner replied, "We have a minister there who can't be bettered."<sup>1</sup> On June 30, 1870, the Treaty was rejected by a tie vote of 28 to 28.

Grant now determined to vent his anger on Sumner who, he believed, had proved disloyal. He spoke to a number of Senators about his removal from the Chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee, but as they were not ready to accede to the President's request, he decided on another method of disciplining him. One of Sumner's close friends was John Lothrop Motley, the American Minister to England. On the day following the rejection of the Treaty, Motley was dismissed from his post. Sumner regarded Motley's removal as an attempt to chastise him and was indignant. He wrote Longfellow, "At last the blow has fallen on Motley. I am unhappy at the thought of the unhappiness in his home. When I see you on the piazza, I will tell you the story of revenge." Motley, however, refused to resign, so Grant notified the British Government to consider Moran, the first secretary of the embassy, as a charge'd'affairs. When the Senate met in December, Motley was recalled and Robert<sup>2</sup> Schenck was appointed in his place.

In his second Annual Message, Grant revived the whole question. He reiterated what he had said in

---

1. E. L. Pierce, Personal Memoirs and Letters of Charles Sumner, Vol. 4, pp. 443-444.

Ibid. p. 445; W. E. Woodward, Meet General Grant, pp. 447-448.





earlier messages concerning the advantages of the annexation of San Domingo, namely, the stimulation of commerce and industry, a market for the products of our farms, remunerative wages to tens of thousands of laborers as yet not on the island, reduction of imports and the turning of the balance of foreign trade in our favor. He then suggested that a committee be appointed by a joint resolution of Congress to negotiate a treaty with the authorities of San Domingo for the annexation of that island, and that an appropriation be made to defray its expense. The question could then be decided by the Senate or by a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress, as in the case of Texas.<sup>1</sup>

Sumner and Grant had now reached the stage where they mutually detested each other. During the recess of Congress, enemies informed Grant that Sumner had been attacking him in his lectures. As a matter of fact, no such attack had been made; but Grant believed it.<sup>2</sup> Hoar says he was having a friendly walk with Grant one day when, on nearing Sumner's house, Grant shook his fist at the house and said, "That man, who lives up there, has abused me in a way which I never suffered from any other man living."<sup>3</sup> All Washington was amused by what

---

1. J. D. Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents. Vol. 7. pp. 99-101

2. Claude Bowers, The Tragic Era, 329-331.

3. Geo. F. Hoar, Autobiography, Vol. 1, p. 211.





each said of the other, "says Woodward.<sup>1</sup> Then came the Presidential Message of Dec. 5, 1870, again urging annexation. To save Grant from embarrassment, Morton proposed that a commission be appointed to investigate and report on the condition of the people on questions affecting annexation. Sumner opposed the resolution and then proceeded to launch into a bitter invective against Grant and his policy. He said he had been informed that Grant had attempted to interfere with the "personnel of the Committee on Foreign Relations" but, when pressed to name his informant, he refused. At a caucus, held later, he was removed from his position, the excuse given being that he was not on "social relations with Fish or Grant."<sup>2</sup>

The Morton bill, calling for the appointment of a commission to investigate conditions in San Fomingo, passed the Senate, but was amended by the House, so that the resolution would not commit Congress to the policy of annexation. The Senate concurred on the amendment and a committee, consisting of Benjamin Wade of Ohio, Andrew White of New York, and Samuel Howe of Massachusetts, was appointed. They remained in San Domingo from January 23, to Feb. 28, and returned with a very favorable report. On the day that they were to

---

1. W. E. Woodward, Meet General Grant, p. 446

2. Claude Bowers, The Tragic Era, pp. 329-331.



was said of the other, "says Webster. Then says the  
Presidential message of Dec. 8, 1890, again making  
announcement. To save space from embarrassment, Boston  
proposed that a commission be appointed to investi-  
gate and report on the condition of the people of  
questioned admitted situation. Senator opposed the  
resolution and soon proceeded to launch into a bitter  
investive against Grant and his policy. He said he had  
been informed that Grant had attempted to interfere  
with the personnel of the Commission on Political Re-  
forms, and, when pressed as to the influence of the  
Grant, as a person, said later, he had no personal know-  
ledge. The answer given being that he was not  
on "social relations with him or family."  
The Boston Bill, calling for the appointment of  
a commission to investigate conditions in New England,  
passed the Senate, but was vetoed by the House, so  
that the resolution would not create progress to the  
city of amendment. The Senate approved on the  
a resolution and a committee, consisting of Senators  
of Ohio, Andrew Johnson of New York, and several others  
was constituted, and appointed. They reported in Jan-  
uary 1891, and January 22, 1891, and returned with a  
very favorable report. In the way that they were to

---

U. S. Senate, The House, Jan. 22, 1891.  
U. S. Senate, The House, Jan. 22, 1891.

arrive from San Domingo, Sumner spoke for "three hours and a half in the Senate on Grant's violation of our Constitution and of International Law.

On April 5, the President transmitted the report of the investigating committee to Congress. As a two-third vote for the treaty could not be procured in the Senate, or a majority vote for a joint message, Grant stated that it was his firm belief that Congress had made a fatal<sup>1</sup> mistake in rejecting the measure. Woodward says, "In this message Grant said both naively and significantly, that, if his plan of annexation had been adopted, the soil of San Domingo 'would have fallen into the hands of the United States Capitalists'".<sup>2</sup>

---

1. J. D. Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, Vol. 7. p. 412.

2. W. E. Woodward, Meet General Grant, p. 446.



and a bill to the Senate on Grant's violation of our  
Constitution and of international law.

On April 3, the President transmitted a report  
of the investigating committee to Congress. As a reg-  
ular third vote for the treaty would not be recorded in the  
Senate, a majority vote for a joint message, Grant  
stated that it was his first belief that Congress had  
made a fatal mistake in rejecting the message. Woodard  
said, "In this message Grant said both publicly and pri-  
vately, that, if his plan of withdrawal had  
succeeded, the bill of San Antonio would have fallen  
into the hands of the United States Legislature."

- 
1. J. B. Rutherford, President and Powers of the  
President, Vol. 7, p. 312.
  2. J. E. Woodard, What Grant Did, p. 144.

## PART V.

## CONCLUSION.

The only definite foreign policy that Grant formulated was the expansion of the United States into the West Indies. The rich, undeveloped, natural resources and the excellent harbor of San Domingo possessed a particular attraction for him. Here was a region that would afford commercial and military advantages to the United States as well as a "haven" to the black race. Moreover, he was anxious to accomplish this enterprise as quickly as possible lest some foreign country would outstrip the United States and reap the rewards, which loomed so huge in his eyes. As to how this foothold was to be obtained, he seemed to give too little consideration. In this, however, he was not actuated by any base motive, but rather led on unwittingly through ignorance of established law.

Instead of accepting the responsibility of Babcock's act, when the latter negotiated the treaty of annexation and pledged the President to use his influence among members of Congress to secure its ratification, Grant should have censured him strongly for exceeding his instructions and compromising the Executive Department.





Grant surely manifested great ignorance in his attitude toward the treaties that Babcock brought back. They were unconstitutional. In the first place, Baez had no right to sell the island, because the Dominican Constitution expressly forbade the cession of any territory to foreign powers. Furthermore, we were threatening Haiti, a power with whom we were presumably on friendly terms. Here was a clear usurpation of the powers of Congress and a violation of international law.

In his attempt to secure the ratification of the treaty by the Senate, Grant again showed that he was not thoroughly cognizant of the dignity of his office as President. He descended to the role of a lobbyist, even going to the Capitol, and calling Senators from their duties to win them to his scheme.

This oft displayed political ignorance is the harder to condone because Grant persisted in it. He refused the advice and opinion of Sumner, who had for eighteen years held a position of great influence and distinction in the Senate. As a general, Grant's word had been a law to his subordinates and he seemed to feel that the same condition should prevail in his relations with his Congress. In fact, he read rebellion in Sumner's attitude and resorted to punishment and vindictiveness. Thus he demanded the removal of Motley, Sumner's friend, from his position as Minister to England on the day following the defeat of the annexation



Greatly manifested by its presence in the

attitude towards the speaker that he had been back.

They are undoubtedly in the first place, back and

no place to talk the same, because the speaker is

in a position to talk the same as the speaker

is, to the speaker, the speaker, as the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

law.

In the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

the speaker, the speaker, the speaker, the speaker

treaty. This was a grave injustice to Motley, because he was not guilty of any serious offense, upon which such recalls are based. He was surely the innocent victim of Presidential revenge. In the following March, at the beginning of the new Congress, Grant's influence forced the removal of Sumner from the Chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee. Sumner's deposition for opposing Grant's policy was as unwarranted as was that of Motley's.

There are other instances in Grant's Foreign Relations where his ignorance of international law might have led to serious complications but for the fact that the United States had, as its Secretary of State, at that time, Mr. Fish, a man of good judgment, calmness, patience, and firmness. By his remarkable tact he was able to avoid the serious difficulties which we should have encountered, if Grant had not been restrained.

In the Cuban controversy, Grant, drifting along under the influence of General Rawlins, favored the recognition of the belligerency of the Cuban insurgents. This would have seriously embarrassed Fish, who had been dilligently developing arguments to secure reparations from the British Government for the recognition of the Confederates during the Civil War. Furthermore, as Fish pointed out, the Cuban insurgents possessed none of the conditions which warranted such recognition. If Grant's policy had prevailed, the Spanish Government would have interfered with our commerce and we would have been in-



freely. This was a grave injustice to Italy, however.

It was not only of any serious character, but also

such results are needed. It was clearly the intention

of the international movement. In the following years,

at the beginning of the last century, there's a

form of a revival of interest in the development of the

international movement. There's a possibility for the

international policy as an international as the result of

international.

There are other instances in which the international

international is international as well as the

international movement but the last part of the

international, as the result of the

international, as the result of the

international. By the international

international movement as well as the

international, it is not the result of the

international, it is not the result of the

international, it is not the result of the

international, it is not the result of the

international, it is not the result of the

international, it is not the result of the

international, it is not the result of the

international, it is not the result of the

international, it is not the result of the

international, it is not the result of the

international, it is not the result of the

international, it is not the result of the

evitably drawn into a war with Spain.

In the Virginius affair, Fish again showed his common sense by refusing to be influenced by national hysteria into making reprisals on Spain. By steadily insisting on reparations, for the loss of American lives, he brought the incident to a close on very satisfactory terms, considering the fact that the vessel was a pirate and had no right to fly the American flag.

In the handling of the controversy with England over the Alabama Claims, Fish scored a diplomatic triumph. By incorporating into the President's message of 1870 a paragraph, recommending that the United States Government take over the private claims, he

forced the British Government to come to terms. In the negotiations, he secured an expression of regret and an agreement from England to incorporate into the Treaty of Washington three rules, which were to guide the judges in their decision and which were certain to result in her conviction. By agreeing to allow the claims for "national" damages, presented by the American agent before the Tribunal, to be ruled out by the judges, he saved the arbitration which had been endangered by this issue.

It has been said of Sumner that he was visionary. As greed, rather than generosity, has ever been the dominant trait of England in her dealings with other countries, perhaps Sumner's demands were far beyond anything we might hope to obtain. On the other hand, it was well



cutting down the number of the

in the various articles. The article is

common sense of reason. It is the only

hysteria into which we have been

leading in the past. For the last few years

we have been leading to a close and very

happy, unbroken line. The last few years

and we are glad to say the weather

is the weather of the country with

over the whole country. The weather

is the weather of the country with

of the weather, recommending the

States Government take over the

Federal the States Government to

negotiations, we have an expansion

appears from the United States

and the United States, which

is the United States and the

condition. It is the United States

condition, presented by the

to be United States, we have

which has been suggested by

It has been said of the

As great, rather than

and the United States

which, perhaps, the

to the United States

known by the United States Government that England felt it expedient to rid herself of her colony at about this time. Sumner may have had this in mind, when he urged his claim, or we may conclude that his real purpose in these demands was to impress on England the enormity of her guilt in the losses that we had sustained, during the war. Fish and Grant were in accord with his policy until after the rupture in their relations occurred.

But whether or not his demands were visionary in respect to England, his opposition to the San Domingo treaty was well founded. He believed the whole scheme of imperialism, which Grant was sponsoring, was a wrong to the inhabitants of the Dominican Republic and a menace to Haiti, in whose welfare he was particularly interested. It would seem that there was much strength in Sumner's contention, for instead of a "haven", annexation would undoubtedly have meant social discrimination for the negroes, and a denial of their rights of self government. Moreover, the whole proceedings were irregular and Sumner, who was thoroughly honest and unselfish, preferred to place the honor and good name of the United States above any material advantages which would accrue to her from such a policy.

Grant was indeed fortunate in having two such upright, able, and conscientious men, as Sumner and Grant in his Cabinet. Neither, of course, was perfect. Being human, they



... by the United States Government ...  
... to this country at about this  
... and this in mind, when it was  
... in 1914, on the occasion of the first session of  
... to express on behalf the industry of  
... in the process of being established, during  
... and Great Britain were in accord with this policy  
... after the rupture in their relations occurred.  
... to not the necessity was necessary in  
... to England, with a view to the same in mind  
... was well founded, as believed the whole of  
... which was suggesting, was a return to  
... of the American Republic and a return  
... in 1914, in which there was a rupture in the  
... it is well known that there was a rupture in the  
... the interest of a "policy", and a return to  
... have been a complete disaster for the  
... and a denial of their rights of self government.  
... the whole proceedings were irregular and unjust,  
... and thoroughly honest and unbiased, related to the  
... and good sense of the whole, I would have  
... advantages which would secure to the United States  
... policy.

... and indeed to the United States in every way possible.  
... and conscientious men, as shown and shown in his  
... of course, was perfect. Being perfect, they

were not always right, but at all times one of the two seemed to possess the right view point and political acumen, necessary to suggest and effect the policy, best suited to the advancement and the success of our Government. The outstanding achievements of this administration may be summed up as follows: the establishment of the principles of arbitration, the judicial decision of the Alabama Claims, and the maintenance of American rights in the complications with Spain.





## BIBLIOGRAPHY.

## BOOKS.

- ADAMS, Charles Francis, "The Treaty of Washington"  
in Lee at Appomattox And Other Papers, Boston And New  
York, Houghton, Mifflin And Company, 1902.
- BOUTWELL, George S., The Lawyer, The Statesman, and The  
Soldier, New York. D. Appleton And Company, 1887.
- BANCROFT, Fred and Dunning, William Schurz, Reminiscences,  
Vol. III. New York, McClure Co. 1908.
- BOWERS, Claude, The Tragic Era, Boston and New York,  
Houghton And Mifflin Company, 1929.
- CHADWICK, French E., The Relations Of The United States  
And Spain, New York, Charles Scribners Sons, 1909.
- COOLIDGE, Louis, Ulysses S. Grant, Boston And New York,  
Houghton Mifflin Company, 1917.
- CROSS, Nelson, The Modern Ulysses, New York, J. S. Redfield,  
1872.
- DAVIS, J. C. Bancroft, Mr. Fish And The Alabama Claims,  
Boston And New York, Houghton, Mifflin And Company, 1893.
- DUNNING, William A. Reconstruction, Political and Econom-  
ic, New York And London, Harper And Brothers, 1907.
- FESSENDEN, Francis, The Life and Public Services of William  
Pitt Fessenden, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin And Company, 1907.



ADAMS, Charles Francis, "The Treaty of Washington"

in International and Other Essays, Boston and New

York, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1902.

BOYD, George B., The Lawyer, The Statesman, and The

Statesman, New York, G. P. Putnam and Company, 1902.

BRADSHAW, Fred and Manning, William George, Washington

and the World, New York, McGraw-Hill Co., 1902.

BRUCE, Charles, The Treaty of Washington, Boston and New York,

Houghton and Mifflin Company, 1902.

CHAMBERLAIN, French A., The Relations of the United States

and Spain, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902.

COCHRAN, Louis, Business A. Grant, Boston and New York,

Houghton Mifflin Company, 1902.

CROSS, Nelson, The Nelson Divisions, New York, J. B. Hurdell,

1902.

DAVIS, J. C. Hancock, The Ship and the Atlantic Cable,

Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1902.

DEWEY, William A., Washington, England and France

in the World War, New York and Boston, 1902.

FERGUSON, John, The Life and Public Services of William

McDonough, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1902.

FISH, Carl, American Diplomacy, New York, Henry Holt, 1919, 3rd edit.

FULLER, Joseph, The American Secretaries Of State And Their Diplomacy. Bemis Edition. Vol. VII. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1923

GARLAND, Hamlin, U. S. Grant, His Life And Character, New York, Doubleday And McClure Co. 1889.

GRANT, U. S. Personal Memoirs of Ulysses S. Grant. Vols. I, II, New York, The Century Co. 1895.

HOAR, George F. Autobiography, New York, Scribner Sons, 1903

HOLMES, Oliver W. John L. Motley, Boston, Houghton Osgood And Co. 1879.

JOHNSON, Willis F., American Foreign Relations, New York, Century Co. 1916.

LATANE, John H., A History of American Foreign Policy, Doubleday, 1927.

MOORE, Claude, The Life of Caleb Cushing, 2 v. New York, Harcourt Brace & Co.

MOTLEY, John L. "The Correspondence of John L. Motley" edited by Geo. Wm. Curtis, N.Y. Harper 1889, 2 V.

PIERCE, E. L., Personal Letters And Memoirs of Charles Sumner, Vol. IV. Boston, Roberts Bros. 1893.

RHODES, James F., History of the United States, Vols. VI. VII. New York, Macmillan Co. 1906.

RUSSELL, J. D., "Around The World With Grant."

SALTER, William, Life of Grimes, N.Y. D. Appleton And Company.



1913, Carl, American Diplomacy, New York, Henry Holt.

1919, 2nd ed.

1925, Joseph, The American Association of States and

Foreign Relations, New York, Henry Holt.

1925, 2nd ed.

1925, Berlin, H. C. Grant, The Life and Character

of Grant, New York, Macmillan and Co., 1925.

1925, Grant, H. C. Grant, The History of Grant

and the Reconstruction, New York, Macmillan and Co., 1925.

1925, Grant, H. C. Grant, The History of Grant

and the Reconstruction, New York, Macmillan and Co., 1925.

1925, 2nd ed.

1925, Grant, H. C. Grant, The History of Grant

and the Reconstruction, New York, Macmillan and Co., 1925.

1925, Grant, H. C. Grant, The History of Grant

and the Reconstruction, New York, Macmillan and Co., 1925.

1925, Grant, H. C. Grant, The History of Grant

and the Reconstruction, New York, Macmillan and Co., 1925.

1925, Grant, H. C. Grant, The History of Grant

and the Reconstruction, New York, Macmillan and Co., 1925.

1925, Grant, H. C. Grant, The History of Grant

and the Reconstruction, New York, Macmillan and Co., 1925.

1925, Grant, H. C. Grant, The History of Grant

and the Reconstruction, New York, Macmillan and Co., 1925.

1925, Grant, H. C. Grant, The History of Grant

and the Reconstruction, New York, Macmillan and Co., 1925.

1925.

STEWART, William M. Reminiscences, Neale Publishing Co.,  
New York and Washington, 1908.

SUMNER, Charles, Works of Charles Sumner Vols. XIII,  
XIV. Boston, Lee and Shepard, 1883.

WARD, Sir A. W. and Gooch, G. P. The Cambridge History of  
British Foreign Policy, Vol. III. New York, The Macmillan Co.  
1923.

WOODWARD, William E. Meet General Grant, Horace Leveright,  
Inc., 1928.



STUART, William. Selected works. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1963.

See also 1963 and 1964.

STUART, William. Books of Charles Sumner. Vol. VII.

V. Boston, Mass. and Oxford, 1963.

STUART, William. Books of Charles Sumner. Vol. VII.

STUART, William. Books of Charles Sumner. Vol. VII.

1963.

STUART, William. Books of Charles Sumner. Vol. VII.

Inc., 1963.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY.

## DOCUMENTS.

Foreign Relations 1872-73, Oct. 29, 1872, pp. 580-84.

Foreign Relations 1874, pp. 923, 926, 929, 931, 933.

Foreign Relations 1874, pp. 927, 936

Foreign Relations 1874, p. 938

Foreign Relations 1874, p. 954.

Foreign Relations 1874, pp. 951, 955.

Foreign Relations 1874, pp. 958, 960, 963, 964, 966.

MOORE, John Basset, A History and Digest of International Arbitrations.

RICHARDSON, James D. "Messages and Papers of the Presidents," Vol. VII, Dec. 6, 1869; May 31, 1870; June 13, 1870; Dec. 5, 1870; Dec. 1, 1873; Dec. 7, 1875.



Foreign Relations 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900.

Foreign Relations 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900.

Foreign Relations 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900.

Foreign Relations 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900.

Foreign Relations 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900.

Foreign Relations 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900.

Foreign Relations 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900.

Foreign Relations 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900.

Foreign Relations 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900.

Foreign Relations 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900.

Foreign Relations 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900.

Foreign Relations 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900. 2 vols. 1870-1900.

## MAGAZINES.

Atlantic Monthly, Jacob D. Cox, 1895 pp 164-69

The Nation, February 3, 1870

The Nation, June 2, 1870 pp 344-47

The Nation, October 20, 1870 pp 250-252

The Nation, November 17, 1870 pp 322-325

The Nation, March 16, 1871 p 169

## PAPERS.

Boston Advertiser, Apr., 16, 1869

New York Tribune, March 24, 1870

New York Tribune, Mat 25, 1870

New York World, March 24, 1870

New York World, March 26, 1870

New York World, March 29, 1870



Atlantic City, N.J., March 2, 1933, 1933-1934-35  
The Nation, February 2, 1933  
The Nation, March 2, 1933, 1933-1934-35  
The Nation, February 2, 1933, 1933-1934-35  
The Nation, March 2, 1933, 1933-1934-35  
The Nation, March 2, 1933, 1933-1934-35

Index.

Atlantic City, N.J., March 2, 1933  
The Nation, March 2, 1933, 1933-1934-35  
The Nation, March 2, 1933, 1933-1934-35  
The Nation, March 2, 1933, 1933-1934-35  
The Nation, March 2, 1933, 1933-1934-35  
The Nation, March 2, 1933, 1933-1934-35



BOSTON UNIVERSITY



1 1719 02573 6341



